Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1867.

VOLUME XLIX.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XIX.

D. D. WHEDON, D.D., EDITOR.

New York:
PUBLISHED BY CARLTON & PORTER,
200 MULBERRY-STREET.
1867.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLIX.

1867.

JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

HURST'S HISTORY OF RATIONALISM 5
J. M'Clintock, D.D., LL.D., New Brunswick, N. J.

THE UNITED STATES AND METHODISM 29
Prof. S. D. Hillman, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

ADAM CLARKE AS A PREACHER 50
Rev. Samuel Dunn, London, England.

REPROBATION 69
C. Alvin Etalii, D.D.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEA OF THE PASTORAL OFFICE 81
Rev. M. J. Cramer, A.M., Chaplain U. S. A., Covington, Ky.

THE WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY—Dr. A. W. SMITH 93
G. P. Disosway, Esq., Staten Island, N. Y.

Foreign Religious Intelligence 105
Foreign Literary Intelligence 110
Synopsis of the Quarterlies 112
Quarterly Book-Table 119
Plan of Episcopal Visitation—1867 164

APRIL NUMBER.

INDIA 165
Edward Thomson, D.D., Bishop M. E. Church, Delaware, Ohio.

FAIRBAIRN ON PROPHECY 182
Henry Bannister, D.D., Professor Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

METHODISM IN CANADA 198
Rev. J. A. Williams, Toronto East, C. W.

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MINISTRY 221
B. H. Nadal, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

CLARK AND MATTISON ON A FUTURE STATE 236
Rev. Charles T. Moss, Milford, N. Y.

THE ORIGINAL PENALTY OF THE LAW 249
Rev. S. M. Merrill, Circleville, Ohio.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN 267
James Porter, D.D., New York.

Foreign Religious Intelligence 287
Foreign Literary Intelligence 292
Synopsis of the Quarterlies 292
Quarterly Book-Table 297

JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

SCRIPTURE INSPIRATION 325
Rev. Gilbert Haven, A.M., Editor Zion's Herald, Boston, Mass.

THE SANSCRIT LANGUAGE 353
Rev. A. B. Hyde, Professor in Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

THE GREEK CHURCH IN ITS RELATION TO THE PROTESTANT. [Second Article.] 369
Rev. R. B. Welsh, Professor in Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT 389
Enoch Pond, D.D., Bangor Theological Seminary.

THE BRAHMO-SAMAJH 400
Rev. T. J. Scott, Budaon, N. W. P., India.

MIGNE'S ROMAN CATHOLIC PUBLISHING HOUSE 415
J. M'Clintock, D.D., New Brunswick, N. J.

Foreign Religious Intelligence 431
Foreign Literary Intelligence 435
Synopsis of the Quarterlies 438
Quarterly Book-Table 452

OCTOBER NUMBER.

PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS ON PREACHING 485
From the French of Athanase Coquerel, Sr.

PAUL'S ARGUMENT AGAINST JUDAIC PREDESTINATION 499
Rev. M. C. Briggs, San Francisco, Cal.

CHURCH MUSIC 513
Bostwick Hawley, D.D., Fort Plain, N. Y.

THE SURE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY 532
E. L. Fancher, Esq., New York.

AN ITALIAN REFORMER; JEROME SAVONAROLA 540
Rev. J. P. Lacroix, Professor Ohio Wesleyan University.

ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION 555
Rev. L. R. Dunn, Jersey City, N. J.

ESTHETICS IN COLLEGIATE EDUCATION 572
Rev. George F. Comfort, Professor Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

OUR MINISTRY 590
Rev. Samuel Dunn.

Foreign Religious Intelligence 607
Foreign Literary Intelligence 611
Synopsis of the Quarterlies 612
Quarterly Book-Table 614

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1867.

ART. I.—HURST'S HISTORY OF RATIONALISM.

History of Rationalism, embracing a Survey of the Present State of Protestant Theology: with an Appendix of Literature. By Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D.D. Second Edition. 8vo., pp. 623. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

THE aim of this work is indicated by its twofold title. It is not simply a history of Rationalism, but also a survey of the state of Protestant theology. Had Dr. Hurst aimed simply to sketch the rise and progress of Rationalism, properly so called, his method would doubtless have been different, and many things now properly placed in his volume would have been excluded from it. The work might have gained in point of unity by this exclusion; but it would have lost in completeness and utility. As it stands, it is to be judged by its professed aim, as expressed in its title.

Rationalism properly and historically is the name of a movement in German theology in the eighteenth century. The essential spirit in this movement was that the human mind is the standard and measure of truth in religion, as in other things. It did not, in the beginning, deny Revelation, but held that Revelation must not only address itself to reason, but must submit to be judged by reason. Its professed aim, in fact, was to reconcile Revelation with science. Starting with the apparently harmless maxim that the Bible must be studied and interpreted on *rational* principles, it began its career by what

seemed to be only a peculiar method of interpretation, namely, that of proceeding historically, and not dogmatically, in the exegesis of Scripture. Ernesti was no skeptic or infidel; he aimed, we have no doubt, to purify and elevate biblical criticism. We cannot say so much of Michaelis, whose culture, like his nature, was less elegant than Ernesti's, and who lacked the spirit of reverence almost wholly. But Michaelis was far from an absolute rejection of Scripture. Nor can even Semler be called an infidel. Had any of these forerunners of the modern pantheism been charged with discarding the Bible, they would have repelled the accusation indignantly.

"Because we love it," they said, "we are putting ourselves to all this trouble of elucidating it. It grieves us beyond measure to see how it has been suffering from the vagaries of weak minds. We are going to place it in the hands of impartial Reason; so that, for once at least, it may become plain to the masses. We will call in all the languages and sciences to aid us in exhuming its long-buried treasures, in order that the wayfaring man, though a fool, may appropriate them. And as to the Church, who would say aught against our venerable mother? We love her dearly. We confess, indeed, that we love the green fields and gray mountain-rocks better than her Sabbath services; nor do we have much respect for her Sabbath at all. But we cherish her memories, and are proud of her glory. Yet the people do not understand her mysteries well enough. They do not love her as much as we do. Therefore we will stir them up to the performance of long-neglected duties. They ignorantly cling too proudly to her forms and confessions. But we will aid them to behold her in a better light. We know the true path of her prosperity, for do you not see that we have been born and bred within her dear fold? Let everybody follow us. We will bring you into light."—Pp. 27, 28.

The movement of which we have spoken lay, it will be observed, entirely within the domain of theology, or rather of theologians. Men who absolutely rejected Christianity were not called Rationalists, but infidels, deists, or atheists. The starting point of the professed unbelievers, and, in fact, their whole line of thought, lay outside of the sphere of Christian ideas, while that of the Rationalists lay within it.

The primary and proper application, then, of the name Rationalist, is clear. It was, as we have said, the title given to certain theologians in the eighteenth century, who assumed to interpret Scripture in the light of reason, but who in reality placed reason above Scripture. The name soon came to be a

term of reproach; and that the more rapidly, as the progress of the new school of "theologians" toward downright infidelity became more and more obvious.

As to the original meaning and application of the term, Dr. Hurst quotes from Rückert, *Der Rationalismus*, a passage which has a force and patness not intended, perhaps, by its author:

> What is Rationalism? We must try to get the meaning from the term itself. And what sort of a term is it? Barbarous enough! Its root is *ratio*, but it is directly from *rationalis* that the word in question is derived. Now this word is good enough in itself, for it signifies *what is conformable to reason, that which possesses the attributes and methods of reason.* Man is a *rational* animal, and it is his rationality that distinguishes him from all other animals. So much for this part of the word Rationalism. Now for the barbarous part of it, the -ism. This termination belongs to another language, the Greek -*ισμός*, and is derived from a verbal ending which cannot be expressed in Latin, namely—*ίζειν*. Now if we examine certain intransitive verbs, such as *μηδίζειν*, *λακωνίζειν*, *ῥωμαΐζειν*, *ἀττικίζειν*, we shall find their common peculiarity is, that the persons meant are not the real persons which the words seem to signify, but only act in their capacity. Not a real Mede *μηδίζει*; no true Spartan *λακωνίζει*; and so of all the rest. But those Greeks who would rather belong to the Medes than be freemen, *act like Medes, would prefer to be under Median rule—μηδίζουσιν.* This -*ισμός* is a termination from this class of verbs, and is employed in reproach and not in praise. Hence *Rationalist* is a term of contempt, and means *not one who is really reasonable, but would like to pass for such.*" Of course the doctor concludes that the word is a most flagrant and unrighteous misnomer; but we accept his philology, and return him our thanks for his etymological *study*.—P. 7.

Now it is clear that the principle of Rationalism tends naturally to the rejection of Christianity as an authoritative system of faith and morals. Yet to class all infidels as Rationalists, without discrimination, leads not only to historical confusion, but also to confusion of thought and argument. Mansel, in his *Limits of Religious Thought*, (Lect. 1,) defines Rationalism as "that system whose final test of truth is placed in the direct assent of the human consciousness, whether in the form of logical deduction, or moral judgment, or religious intuition, by whatever previous process those faculties may have been raised to their assumed dignity as arbitrators." He adds that "the Rationalist, as such, is not bound to maintain that a

divine revelation of religious truth is impossible, nor even to deny that it has actually been given. He may admit the existence of the revelation as a fact; he may acknowledge its utility as a temporary means of instruction for a ruder age; he may even accept certain portions as of universal and permanent authority. But he assigns to some superior tribunal the right of determining what is essential to religion and what is not. He claims for himself and his age the privilege of accepting or rejecting any given revelation, wholly or in part, according as it does or does not satisfy the conditions of some higher criterion to be supplied by the human consciousness."

Speaking generally, then, the Rationalist, in theology, is one who, professing to adhere to Christianity, yet receives the Christian Revelation only so far forth as it agrees with his own notions.

Historically, the development of this spirit, since its first decided manifestation in the eighteenth century, may be summed up as follows: The first declared aim of the Rationalists was to interpret the Bible, as has been said, on rational principles; and by this they really meant, to find nothing in the Scriptures beyond the scope of human reason. Not supposing the sacred writers to be impostors, nor denying the record to be a legitimate source of religious instruction, they sought to free it of everything supernatural. Gradually they came to regard it, not as a direct revelation from God, but as a product of the human mind under the general guidance of Divine Providence, but in no miraculous or supernatural way. The miracles of Scripture therefore had to be explained away; and this was done in any mode that the ingenuity or philosophy of the expositor might suggest. But even the most elastic exegesis would not explain every case; some parts of the narrative were stubbornly unyielding. For men who had gone so far, it was easy to go further; the text itself was attacked; this passage was held to be doubtful; that was corrupt; a third was spurious. Still, the Rationalists agreed with the orthodox Supernaturalists in admitting that there was at bottom a basis of substantial truth in the records. The admission was a fatal one. It was soon shown that the vaunted "criticism" of the Rationalists was not only rash, but arbitrary and absurd; that the chief objections which it brought against the Gospel history

were as old as Porphyry, or, at least, as the English Deists, and had been refuted again and again; that the errors of interpretation into which the olden expositors had fallen might be avoided without touching the truth and inspiration of the Evangelists; and, in a word, that there could be no medium between open infidelity and the admission of a supernatural revelation. It was at this point that Strauss brought out his mythical theory. His book gave the *coup de grace* to Rationalism, properly so called, by its masterly exposure of the paltriness of the so-called rationalistic criticism in its application to the text and interpretation of Scripture. Strauss drove the old Rationalism out of the field, to make way for his myths; Neander, Ebrard and others, in turn, exploded the myths; so that nothing remained but a return to honest, candid, and *believing* criticism.

The object of the work before us is to unfold at length the history which we have thus summarily sketched. But Dr. Hurst's field has necessarily been widened still further by the bearings of Rationalism proper upon infidelity on the one hand, and upon orthodox theology on the other. The theological Rationalists are not the only class of writers and thinkers who claim to obey reason, and reason only, as the supreme guide. The principle of the absolute supremacy of the natural faculties of man is common to all classes of infidels. They all agree that truth, so far as man is capable of reaching truth, can be reached by unassisted reason. Moreover, whatever may be their differences of opinion as to the substantial value and authority of Christianity, they all agree in the doctrine that Christianity is to be judged by reason, the ultimate test of religious truth, as well as of all other truth. In this view Semler and Renan, Bretschneider and Comte, though wide as the poles asunder in many respects, may be classed together, in a general way, as Rationalists.

But the influence of the Rationalistic method has been felt not merely in the schools of unbelief, but also within the domain of orthodox Christianity. The strifes and storms of the eighteenth century left their mark upon theology, especially on the Continent of Europe, for good as well as for evil. The enthusiasm of reason, as Jacobi aptly styled the spirit of Rationalism, generated naturally a new enthusiasm of faith

on the part of true believers. The Rationalists, moreover, brought a most acute and industrious, if not always fair criticism to bear upon the Christian records, and they made a fresh study of those records an imperative duty for the advocates of the faith, who burnished their weapons for the struggle, and often found it necessary, in the course of the fight, to make new systems both of attack and of defense. It was discovered, also, that the question in dispute was the fundamental one whether, after all, there be such a thing as practical religion or no. As Neander happily puts the issue, it lay "in opposite views of the relation of God to the world, of the personality of spirit, of the nature of sin, and of the relation between this world and the next. The real controversy does not lie between an old and a new view of Christianity, but between Christianity and a human invention directly opposed to it. It is nothing less than a struggle between Christian theism and a system of world- and self-deification. This system had to uphold itself, by a relative historical necessity, in theological and philosophical rationalism, in order to be overthrown by the power of Christian truth in the natural progress of life and thought."*

These considerations show the fitness of the double title which Dr. Hurst has prefixed to his work. That title binds him to trace the origin of Rationalism; to follow its progress, marking its steps of development and degeneration; and to show its results within the whole field of theology. We shall follow his footsteps so far as to develope his method of procedure.

After an introduction giving various definitions and descriptions of Rationalism and of the various classes of Rationalists, he gives a rapid sketch of the controversial period in German theology, succeeding the Reformation, and of its unhappy effects in the general decay of vital religion in the following century, through the petrifaction, so to speak, of the living doctrines of the Reformation into mere intellectual formulas. This is followed by a brief history of the Pietistic reaction against dry and lifeless orthodoxy; of its spiritual and philanthropic triumphs, and of the causes of its decline. These last are summed up as follows:

*Neander's Life of Christ, preface.

Pietism lacked a homogeneous race of teachers. Here lay the secret of its overthrow. Had the founders been succeeded by men of much the same spirit, and equally strong intellect, its existence would have been guaranteed, as far as anything religious can be promised in a country where there is a State Church to control the individual conscience. The great mistake of Lutheranism was in failing to adopt it as its child. The skeptical germ which soon afterward took root, gave evidence that it could prove its overthrew for a time, at least; but the evils of Rationalism were partially anticipated by the practical teachings of the Pietists. Rationalism in Germany, without Pietism as its forerunner, would have been fatal for centuries. But the relation of these tendencies, so plainly seen in the ecclesiastical history of Germany, is one of long standing. From the days of Neo-Platonism to the present they have existed, the good to balance the evil, Faith to limit Reason. They have been called by different names; but Christianity could little afford to do without it or its equivalent, in the past; and the Church of the Future will still cling as tenaciously and fondly to it or to its representative.—P. 102.

The next chapter treats of the philosophy of Wolf, and of the importation of English and French Deism into Germany. The spirit of the age found its representative man in Frederick II., so-called the Great, king of Prussia.

The Deism of France was now a coadjutor with that of England in the devastation of Germany. The throne of Frederick II. was the exponent and defender of the hollow creed. The military successes of that king gave him an authority that few monarchs have been able to wield, while his well-known literary taste and capacity enlisted the admiration of men of culture throughout the Continent. Born to bear the sword, he surprised his subjects by the same felicity in the use of the pen; and the man who could leave to his successors a treasury with a surplus of seventy-two millions of thalers, an army of two hundred and twenty thousand men, a kingdom increased by twenty-nine thousand square miles, and a people grown since his accession from two millions to thrice that number, was not a king who could be without great moral weight among his own subjects. And it was known that he was a skeptic, for he made no secret of it. No traces of the old Pietism of his harsh father were visible in the son. Gathering around him such men as Voltaire, La Mettrie, Maupertuis, and others whom his gold could attach to him, he was the same king in faith and literature that he was in politics. Claiming to be a Deist, it is probable that he was a very liberal one. It is more than likely that he was truthful in his description of himself when he wrote to d'Alembert that he had never lived under the same roof with religion. He claimed for his meanest subjects the right to serve God in their own way; but all the power of his example was at work in drawing the people from the old faith. He hesitated not

to supplant evangelical professors and pastors by free-thinkers, and at any time to bring ridicule on any religious fact or custom. That thin-visaged man in top boots and cocked hat, surrounded by his infidels and his dogs at Sans Souci, dictated faith to Berlin and to Europe. He would have no one within the sunshine of royalty whom he could not use as he wished; and just as soon as Voltaire would be himself he became disgraced. But Frederick lived to see the day when insubordination sprang up in his army, and in many departments of public life. It came from the abnegation of evangelical faith. And it is no wonder that when the old king saw the disastrous effects of his own theories upon his subjects, he said he would willingly give his best battle to place his people where he found them at his father's death. But the seed had been sown, and Prussia was destined to be only a part of the harvest-field of tares.—Pp. 122–124.

The general ferment of the intellect of the age affected, of course, the spirit of theology and the life of the Church. The period from 1750 to 1810 is fixed by our author as the limit of the range of the "destructive" theological Rationalism, beginning with Semler (born 1725, died 1791) and ending with Schleiermacher, (born 1768, died 1834,) who, in fact, though to a certain extent unconsciously, inaugurated the renovation of the theology of belief. This part of the work is, perhaps, more carefully elaborated than any other. Its substance may be summed up as follows:

The old systematic theology, undermined both by Pietism and Deism, had lost its hold upon the Church. The revival of criticism brought new principles and methods to bear both upon the text of Scripture and upon its interpretation. The brilliant scholarship of Ernesti, and the rugged but yet masterly studies of Michaelis, applied to both the Old and the New Testaments, dissipated many superstitions, made the examination of the text a simple question of criticism, and established the doctrine that the words of the Bible, like the words of any other book, are to be interpreted according to the fundamental laws of language and of history. But it was with Semler, and that too in the University of Halle, the ancient seat of Pietism and the recognized fountain of spiritual religion, that the modern theological Rationalism openly took its rise. Semler was bred a Pietist, and his early religious experience was a remarkable one. He tells us that even in his boyhood, tortured and torn by doubt and struggle, he often went out at night upon the

great square in front of the orphan school, and cried, in the bitterness of his soul, "O that I were but a piece of wood or a lump of ice." He seems to have quieted his mental struggles by adopting the distinction between personal religion and scientific theology. "He believed that a man might be a true Christian in heart, and yet not receive with the understanding all the doctrines which are revealed to the intellect."* This distinction had been made by the Pietists, but in a very different sense, and with very different immediate results. Yet it was one of the mistakes which caused the decay of Pietism and the rapid rise of Rationalism. To disparage the intellect is a temptation to which men of earnest religious life are constantly prone. But the intellect of man is given him by God, as well as the heart. True consecration commands the culture and devotion of the mind as well as of the heart. There is no opposition between true knowledge and true religion; it is only science "falsely so called—it is only man's wisdom," which is not true wisdom—that is the object of Paul's reprobation. Now Semler held fast, in feeling at least, and to a certain extent in practice, the experimental religion of the Pietists; but, on the other hand, so far from disparaging the intellect, he gave it absolute supremacy in what he called its proper sphere. His own mind was critical, not constructive; and almost all his work as professor and writer was therefore destructive work. His criticism was incomplete, hasty, and reckless. His studies of the canon ended in the rejection of several books of the Old Testament whose authenticity is now, after the additional criticism of a century, admitted even by professed Rationalists. His theory of "accommodation" was held at the time to be a brilliant stroke of talent; but it has no place now in the schools. That his influence upon the theology of his age was very great is undeniable; but the only real and permanent service which he rendered to the science was his opening up the new field of the history of theology, of which branch he may be called, in a practical sense, the founder. Dr. Hurst sums up the results of Semler's work as follows:

> Semler was not the founder of a school, for he advanced no elaborate system and possessed no organizing power. Great as

* Hagenbach, *German Rationalism*, N. Y., 1865, p. 78.

were the results of his labors, no one was more surprised at them than himself. Two or three immediate disciples, who had heard him lecture, were enamored of his theories; but as they were men of moderate capacity their activity produced no permanent effect upon the public mind. It was in another respect that he was mighty. Some of his contemporaries who taught in other universities seized upon his tenets and began to propagate them vigorously. They made great capital out of them for themselves. Semler invaded and overthrew what was left of the popular faith in inspiration after the labors of Wolf, but here he stopped. His adherents and imitators commenced with his abnegation of inspiration, and made it the preparatory step for their attempted annihilation of revelation itself. Soon the theological press teemed with blasphemous publications against the Scriptures; and men of all the schools of learning gave themselves to the work of instruction. Göttingen, Jena, Helmstedt, and Frankfort-on-the-Oder were no longer schools of prophets, but of Rationalists and Illuminists.—P. 137.

The next prominent figure in Dr. Hurst's picture is Lessing, (born 1729, died 1783.) While in charge of the great Ducal library at Wolfenbüttel, he published (1774–1778) certain so-called *Fragments*, professedly found in manuscript in the library, but now known to have been the work of Professor Reimarus, in which the principles of the English Deism were substantially taught. The fundamental thought of the book is, that the convictions of Christians as to the truth of their religion are of no more value than those of Mohammedans and Jews, unless those convictions rest on a free and unprejudiced use of reason. The "Fragments" are not written loosely or flippantly, but are full of acute and subtle thought, expressed with clearness and earnestness.

The effect of the work was electrical; the theology of the age, both Rationalistic and Christian, seemed to spring into new life in a moment. The "Fragments" were answered from the press in journals and pamphlets; and the pulpits soon rang out from one end of Germany to the other. Lessing declared that his object in publishing them was to stir up the public mind, and to put an end to the stagnation of theology. If this were his real purpose, he gained it most effectually. His brilliant literary career consisted of a series of "awakening" appeals to the intellect of Germany; and the modern German literature owes its form and pressure more perhaps to him, than to any other writer of the eighteenth century. But the effect

of his varied and wonderful literary labors on the Christianity of his age was, on the whole, disastrous. What Emerson has been to the youth of New England in the nineteenth century, that Lessing was to the German mind of the eighteenth. The literature which grew up under Lessing's reign, and which was imbued with his spirit, was, in the main, a rationalist if not an infidel literature.

What Lessing did for the literature of the age, Kant accomplished for its philosophy. He wrought a change in that domain which not only affected the current of philosophy in Germany, but also gave tone and tendency to modern thought throughout Europe.

> As Descartes had broken up the scholastic philosophy by considering man apart from his experience, so Kant now gave the death-blow to the philosophy of Protestant Germany by looking at the mind apart from its speculations. "The moral effect of his philosophy," says Mr. Farrar, "was to expel the French Materialism and Illuminism, and to give depth to the moral perceptions; its religious effect was to strengthen the appeal to reason and the moral judgment as the test of religious truth; to render miraculous communication of moral instruction useless, if not absurd; and to reawaken the attempt which had been laid aside since the Wolfian philosophy, of endeavoring to find a philosophy of religion."—P. 162.

The critical philosophy of Kant led inevitably to a denial of the supernatural. One of its results was the sharp distinction, in the theology of Germany, between Rationalism, that is, the admission of revelation as possible, along with the principle of the supremacy of reason: Naturalism, that is, the denial of any possible truth (for man) above and beyond nature, and hence the denial of the fact and even of the possibility of divine revelation to man; and Supernaturalism, which maintains revelation as a valid and necessary source of religious knowledge. Kant did not in terms reject Christianity. On the contrary, he bowed reverently before the name of Christ, and spoke of himself, when some of his idolatrous disciples compared him with the Saviour, "as a bungler, who only sought, according to the best of his capacity, to interpret Christ."* He held fast the fundamental doctrines of all religion—God, immortality, and retribution—but held them

* Varowski, *Life of Kant*, cited by Hagenbach, *History of Rationalism*, p. 225.

only as demands of the practical or moral reason, not as truths of the intellect or pure reason. Indeed, by confining human thought between the limits of space and time, he necessarily excluded all the great problems of man's nature and destiny from the range of the intellect. In his denial of the capacity of reason to comprehend divine things, he approached to the position of the Pietists, and indeed to that of the orthodox of all ages. But the Church, recognizing the feebleness of reason, has always gone directly to revelation for light upon the tremendous questions which reason cannot solve, but which at the same time reason cannot put aside. Kant's fundamental principle, on the other hand, makes even the recognition of a supernatural revelation impossible to man. He proved that reason is insufficient; but he did not draw the inference (which the Church has always drawn) that revelation is therefore necessary. The natural consequence followed: while a few Kantians, such as Storr and Reinhard, held Kant's doctrine along with the belief in revelation, the bulk of his disciples became Rationalists, and some of them even avowed infidels.

The course of German philosophy from Kant to Hegel is not treated by Dr. Hurst with sufficient fullness or clearness. We have not succeeded in gathering from the few pages he devotes to the subject, a definite idea of the effect of this philosophical movement upon theology. We hope that in future editions of the work he will recast this portion of it carefully.

His treatment of the literary influences of the time is far more satisfactory. His sketches of Herder, Schiller, and Goethe, (in the seventh chapter,) though brief, are spirited, and bring out well the points at which their influence impressed theology. The Rationalistic scheme of popular education, first fully set in motion by Basedow, and under which a whole generation of German children were trained, is clearly set forth, both as to its methods and its results. This procedure seemed to crown the triumph of Rationalism; if the youth of the land were trained, not in the blind beliefs of the ages of faith, but in the bold exercise of their natural faculties, and so fully imbued with the spirit of the "age of reason," the battle might be considered gained. Dr. Hurst gives an

example of the kind of instruction by which the German boys and girls of the latter third of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth were edified, in an extract from Becker's *Universal History for the Young*, of which a second edition was issued at Berlin in 1806.

Speaking of the person and character of Christ, the author says: "Jesus probably got the first notion of his undertaking from being a friend of John, and going often to his father's, who was a priest; and from the Gospel it appears that the sight of feasts and of the crowd of worshipers had a great effect upon him. It is doubtful whether Jesus and John were sent into Egypt for their education, or were taught by the Essenes, and then sent into Palestine as embassadors of that sect, with secret support and according to arranged plan. . . . The indications of the Messiah in the Old Testament had produced great effect on Jesus and John, who were both hot-heads, such as destiny raises for some great purpose. We are in danger, therefore, of judging them unjustly, especially from the great mixture of high and low, clear and obscure, in them."—P. 190.

But Rationalism, not content with its mastery of the philosophy, the literature, the theology, and the education of the age, undertook also to reform the worship of the common people, by corrupting the very hymns in which they praised God in the great congregation. Church dignitaries, superintendents, and court preachers joined in this vandal work. The old and precious strains in which the Church had embodied her love for the person of Christ, and her trust in his redemption, were despoiled of all their inspiration. Even the music, which had so long been the medium in which the eternal harmonies of divine truth had found utterance in sound, was not spared; the old chorals were either altered or driven out to make way for more "temperate" strains, or for passages borrowed from secular music. "The masses began to sing less; and the period of coldest skepticism in Germany, like similar conditions in other lands, was the season when the congregations, the common people, and the children sang least, and most drowsily."

The first decade of the nineteenth century saw two apparent triumphs in Germany: one, the triumph of Rationalism over Supernaturalism in the field of thought; the other, the triumph of France in the field of political power. Both victories seemed to be assured. If any one had predicted,

after the battle of Jena, in 1806, that within a decade Germany should have driven out the French and taken back her ancient faith in Christ, he would have been held simply for a dreamer. Yet the seeds of decay were planted, from the beginning, both in the empire of Napoleon and in the empire of Rationalism. Both were temporary phenomena—necessary, doubtless, to the progress of humanity, but yet essentially ephemeral.

In the sphere of philosophy, Fichte, beginning with Kantism, passed through extreme idealism to practical realism. The sorrows and the shame of his native land, trodden under foot by the invader, pierced his breast. In 1807–8 he delivered in Berlin, amid the very braying of French trumpets, his *Reden an die Deutschen*, (Addresses to the Germans.) Again, in 1813, he lectured *Ueber den Begriff des wahren Kriegs*, (On the Idea of a true War.) These fiery appeals stirred the heart of Germany, and contributed greatly to the overthrow of Napoleon.

This period of storm purified the atmosphere both of philosophy and theology. In the midst of it appeared the noblest figure (except Neander's) in modern German theology. To Schleiermacher (born 1768, died 1834) is unquestionably due the revival of spiritual religion in Germany; and Dr. Hurst does not fail to render him due honor. Speaking of his *Discourses on Religion*, (1799,) Dr. Hurst remarks that

> There were multitudes of the educated and cultivated throughout the land who, having become unfriendly to Christianity through the persistence of the Rationalists, were equally indisposed to be satisfied with a mere destructive theology. Something positive was what they wanted; hence the great service of Schleiermacher in directing them to Christianity as the great sun in the heavens, and then to the heart as the organ able to behold the light. His labor was inestimably valuable. His utterances were full of the enthusiasm of youth, and, years later, he became so disatisfied with the work, that he said it had grown strange even to himself. As if over-careful of his reputation, to a subsequent edition he appended large explanatory notes, in order to harmonize his recent with his former views. It would have been more becoming the mature man to leave those earnest appeals to reap their own reward. The times had changed; and the necessity which had first called forth his appeal to the idolaters of doubt was sufficient apology. Schleiermacher wrote other works, of which he and his disciples were much prouder; but we

doubt if he ever issued one more befitting the class addressed, or followed with more beneficial results. Since his pen has been stopped by death, those very discourses have led many a skeptic in from the cold storm which beat about him, and given him a place at the warm, cheerful fireside of Christian faith.—Pp. 227, 228.

The twenty years that followed the publication of Schleiermacher's *Discourses* included the war of liberation and the overthrow of French dominion in the political sphere; the development of the speculative school in philosophy, proceeding from Fichte through Schelling and Hegel, demonstrating the shallowness of Rationalism and empiricism; and the fair opening of the great battle between Rationalism and supernaturalism, in which, as in all the strifes in which Christianity has been arrayed against infidelity, from the time of Celsus until now, truth has vindicated her supremacy. In all this period Schleiermacher is a central figure in the strife: easily pre-eminent as philosopher, theologian, and preacher. Educated among the Moravians, his own religious convictions were profound; his sense of the need of personal piety was absorbing; his belief in the divinity of Christianity was supreme. He was, at the same time, intellectually, one of the most highly gifted men of his age; and his intellectual activity has rarely been rivaled in any age. Uniting the keenest dialectic power with a discursive faculty and a power of imagination that might almost class him among great poets, he found no department of human knowledge alien to his tastes or inaccessible to his capacity. His studies ranged not merely over the whole field of theology, but penetrated the deepest recesses of ancient as well as of modern philosophy; and with these pursuits he combined scientific philology and the highest walks of art and taste. In each of these he was not a mere student, or amateur, but a master, and acknowledged as such by those whom all the world recognizes as masters in their respective branches. He was a man, at the same time, whose power of will, and whose moral and social qualities commanded the reverence and the love of all who shared his intimacy. With all this his bodily frame was feeble and delicate, yet his royal soul so ruled and inspired it that labors which would wear out the strongest of other men,

seemed to sit lightly on him, frail as his organization was. In his theological opinions he was, indeed, in many respects, far away from what we hold to be the true line of Christian belief; yet the man who, in the midst of infidels all his life, so strenously upheld salvation through Christ as the real and essential central-point of the Gospel; the man who, in his dying hours, declared that his hope and his faith rested securely on the "atoning death of Jesus Christ, his body, and his blood"—could not but belong to the "fellowship of the saints."

Attempts were made, by the so-called *mediation* divines, to reconcile Rationalism with orthodoxy; and this movement received new impetus from the union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Prussia, under Frederick William III., in 1817. But these attempts, laudable as they were, failed one after another; the two systems were radically antagonistic; one or the other must reign supreme. This result had been already pretty clearly discerned, when, in 1821, Schleiermacher published his *Christliche Glaube*, (System of Christian Doctrine,) a work which was the culmination of the so-called mediation-theology, but at the same time was the beginning of a new era of religious thought. It demonstrated that religion is an essential thing to man, and that it is a life of the heart, independent of all philosophy. But yet Schleiermacher seized but half the truth; religion concerns the whole man, not merely the sensibilities; it is the life of man, with all its capacities of willing, thinking, imagining, as well as of suffering and feeling. What is *true* in religion must be true for all men, and must therefore stand the test of thought as well as of feeling. It is the old story of the divorce of faith from knowledge, under a new form. Dr. Hurst, while doing ample justice to the splendid gifts of Schleiermacher, and his great services to theology, does not fail to note his grave errors with regard to inspiration, the Trinity, and other doctrines. Nevertheless he cites with approval the words in which Neander announced the death of Schleiermacher: "We have just lost a man from whom will be dated a new era in the history of theology." That era is the transition from the negative and destructive tendency of Rationalism to the positive Christian theology, now in process of reconstruction.

One of the chief actors in this reconstruction was Neander, the noblest figure in modern theology, who was himself first brought to Christ by the reading of Schleiermacher's *Discourses on Religion*, but whose theology far transcended that of his master, in point of clearness, definiteness, and scriptural character, although it, too, bears the marks of the period of storm and strife in which it was developed. But we have not space to dwell upon his share in the work of renovation, nor upon the process itself. It must suffice for us to say, in brief, that the supremacy of Rationalism as a *doctrine* was overthrown by the labors of Schleiermacher and his school. Exegetical Rationalism, however, still lived, even within that school, as well as without it. The crisis for that form of error arrived in 1835, with the publication of Strauss's *Life of Jesus*. Two things of great moment for modern Christianity were accomplished by that book, and by the studies to which it gave rise. First, the old exegetical Rationalism (such as that of Eichhorn and Paulus) was completely driven from the field of theology; and secondly, the critical study of the Gospel history was entered upon anew, with better aims, better apparatus, and more complete results than ever before. The efforts of the Tübingen school to recover the ground lost after 1835 have been tremendous; but even the vast scholarship and subtle critical faculty of Baur and his coadjutors have failed to shake the credit of the Gospels, or to gain currency for any other theory of the origin of Christianity, than that drawn by the Church in all ages from the Gospels considered as an authentic and inspired record. The old Rationalism of Germany has, by its own natural development, passed into Pantheism and Atheism. Here its history proper comes to an end; and accordingly Dr. Hurst's remaining chapters on this part of his subject are occupied, more gratefully, with an exhibition of the doctrines, labors, and prospects of the present evangelical school of Germany, and with the practical movements indicating and springing from new religious life, such as schools, hospitals, and missions.

Our rapid sketch has sufficiently indicated our author's method. It is substantially the same as that adopted by Saintes in his *Histoire du Rationalisme*, and by Hagenbach in his *Kirchengeschichte d.* 18 *und* 19 *Jahrhunderts*. Both of

these writers, as well as our author, trace the genesis of German Rationalism from the rigid orthodoxy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, through the career of the Wolfian philosophy, there action from both in Mysticism and Pietism, and the influence of English and French Deism, to the Rationalism of the eighteenth century. Dr. Hurst is therefore in very good company. Yet we think his work would have gained in clearness had he more nearly followed the method of Kahnis in his *German Protestantism.* That writer begins with a sketch of the history of the modern philosophy known in Germany as the philosophy of "enlightenment," or "Illuminism," (so called from its formal principle, namely, that clearness is the rule and criterion of truth,) from Descartes, its so-called founder, down to its culmination and overthrow in Kant and the subjective idealists. This philosophy gave birth to an "enlightened" theology, that is, the so-called Rationalistic theology, which is the second topic in Kahnis's division; while the renovation of theology constitutes its third and concluding part. This method not only allows, but demands, a fuller development than Dr. Hurst has given of the philosophical systems which gave rise to the critical and theological Rationalism of Germany.

Thus far we have accompanied our author only over the field of German Rationalism. We cannot dwell at the same length upon his excellent chapters on Holland, France, and England, although it is perhaps in these that the merits of his book are most conspicuous. The chapters on Holland are particularly worthy of commendation, as throwing a flood of light upon the movement of theology in a country whose modern literature is very little studied by the rest of the world. In the days when Latin was the common language of European scholarship, the names of the great Dutch professors were household words in other lands; but now, as few men out of Holland read Dutch, the names of Van Os, Capadose, and Van Prinsterer come to us with all the charm of new discoveries. Our readers could nowhere find in small compass, so great an amount of information about the new theological school of Holland, and the great controversy between orthodoxy and Rationalism now pending in that country, as

in Dr. Hurst's fifteenth chapter. The sketch of French Rationalism is not so thoroughly worked out as that of Holland; yet it gives us a series of vivid sketches of the great leaders of the modern critical school—Réville, Scherer, Renan, and others—on the one hand, and of the brilliant writers of the Evangelical school, such as Pressensé and Guizot, on the other.

Dr. Hurst devotes several chapters to the history of Rationalism in England. Here he comes upon ground more difficult, perhaps, than any other in his book, because the movement is chiefly one of our own time, and is, in fact, still in process of development. It is easier to describe the battles of the last century than of the present. But the difficulties of the task have been largely overcome by Dr. Hurst's patient and persevering labors.

> The present condition of Anglican theology is an illustration of intellectual repayment. Two centuries ago England gave Deism to Germany, and the latter country is now paying back the debt with compound interest. After the Revolution of 1789, and the brilliant ascendency of Napoleon Bonaparte, the French spirit rapidly lost its hold upon the English mind. But there immediately arose a disposition to consult German theology and philosophy. English students frequented the German universities, and the works of the leading thinkers of Berlin, Heidelberg, and Halle were on sale in the bookstores of London. The intimate relations of the royal family of England to Germany, together with the alliance between the German States and Great Britain for the arrest of French arms, increased the tendency until it assumed importance and power. The fruit was first visible in the application of German Rationalism and philosophy to English theology. When Coleridge came from the fatherland with a new system of opinions, he felt as proud of his good fortune as Columbus did on laying a continent at his sovereign's feet. Ever since that profound thinker assumed a fixed position, a reaction against orthodoxy has been progressing in the Established Church. There are reasons why the slow but effectual introduction of German Rationalism has been taking place imperceptibly.—Pp. 453, 454.

Dividing English Rationalism into three departments—philosophical, literary, and critical—Dr. Hurst finds the modern origin of the first in Samuel Taylor Coleridge. In this he agrees with Mr. Rigg, whose *Modern Anglican Theology* gives the best view of the theological philosophy of Coleridge, and of its influence upon religious thought in England, that we

know of.* The parentage of literary Rationalism in England is attributed by our author to Thomas Carlyle; while the critical Rationalism of the *Essays and Reviews* is a recent but inevitable fruit of the seed planted by the transcendentalists of the Coleridgean school. The culmination of this so-called criticism has already arrived in Colenso, of whose singular episcopal career Dr. Hurst gives a copious sketch. This is followed by a very valuable chapter on the present state of parties in the Church of England. The Low Church still includes the larger part of the Evangelical clergy; but it has passed its prime, and shows obvious signs of division and decay. The High Church includes the old normal Churchman, or Anglican as he learned in the last decade to call himself; the Romanizing Churchman, or Puseyite; and the indifferent or political Churchman. The Broad Church includes, first, the active and energetic class of writers and preachers of whom Arnold of Rugby was the type, called by Dr. Hurst the First Broad Church; secondly, the avowed Rationalists of the *Essays and Reviews*, named the Second Broad Church; and thirdly, a class of hangers on who belong to the school by accident of place or circumstances. The eighteen thousand working clergymen of the Church of England are supposed to be distributed in the proportion given in the following table, which Dr. Hurst makes up from data authorized by Conybeare and Dean Stanley:

High Church.	Normal Type—Anglican	3,600
	Exaggerated Type—Tractarian	1,000
	Stagnant Type—High and Dry	2,500
Low Church.	Normal Type—Evangelical	3,500
	Exaggerated Type—Recordite	2,600
	Stagnant Type—Low and Slow	700
Broad Church.	Normal Type—Theoretical and Anti-Theoretical	3,100
	Exaggerated Type—Extreme Rationalists	300
	Stagnant Type	700

Our limits allow of nothing more than a glance at Dr. Hurst's final chapters, which treat of the rise and progress of Rationalism in America. He finds the movement chiefly within the sphere of Unitarianism, in which its extreme positions are to be found in Channing, nearly allied to orthodoxy, on the one hand; and in Theodore Parker, denying that Christianity is the absolute religion, on the other. As to the power and prev-

* The substance of this book first appeared in a series of able papers furnished by Dr. Rigg for the pages of this Review.

alence of Rationalism in this country, he concludes, that while the movement has not yet penetrated the general life of theology or of the people, there is yet enough of force and vitality in it to arrest the attention and awaken the activity of the Church. Speaking of the efforts of the Rationalists to diffuse their principles in the current literature of the day, and even in books for children, he says:

> Their predecessors in Europe sought to make children ashamed of the old truths, by casting sarcasm on the strong faith and evangelical piety of the forefathers. They then aimed to show that the Church and theology are altogether behind the age, and that science and art are advancing with a rapidity which must leave all dogmatism and authority far behind. They afterward examined the Scriptures by the light of reason alone, and, by this idea, deluded multitudes of the young and inexperienced into the darkness and doubt which were never removed. This last effort may be the next one to which American Rationalism will address itself. The Church in this country has partaken of the pride awakened by our unexampled national prosperity; and many of her noblest sons had well-nigh come to the conclusion, before the outbreak of the late civil war, that she must inevitably prosper, simply because of the remarkable temporal blessings which God had lavishly given. But without faith nothing can be accomplished, and three decades may be sufficient to so change the whole aspect of our religious life that the Church may become thoroughly Rationalistic; her sanctuaries frequented, and her posts of honor occupied, by the worshipers of reason. The fidelity of the past will not be able to meet the emergency of the present. The Church in the wilderness was not permitted to lay up manna in advance. Our civilization is undergoing a complete revolution. The field is newly plowed by the events of the last few years, and it becomes the Church to scatter the seeds of truth with an unsparing hand. If this land is to be blessed with pure faith, as in past years, a faith strong enough to repel every blow of skepticism, to the Church, as an instrument, and not to our natural growth, shall be attributed this popular prosperity. If we would secure for future years an uncorrupted faith, the enaction of pure laws, the introduction of the gospel into every social class, an increased enthusiasm in missionary labors, the intense union of all parts of our country, and the united progress of piety and theological science, the duty of the present hour must be discharged.—Pp. 575, 576.

We must not omit mention of the valuable *Appendix of Literature* at the close of the volume, in which Dr. Hurst gives a copious list of modern writers on both sides of the Rationalistic controversy. It manifests not only the industry of the author,

but also great accuracy and extent of information on the literature of the subject. Nowhere else can so copious and complete a bibliography of Rationalism be found.

Our survey of Dr. Hurst's volume suffices to show that it is a work of great value, and also that it is very timely. It treats the history of Rationalism with a fullness and completeness rivaled by no other English writer, and evinces industrious and extended research and copious learning. It gives a map of the field of free thought in the present age, showing fairly its length and breadth, where it trenches on the domain of faith, and where it reaches into the dark territory of unbelief. For ordinary readers it contains all the information on the subject they will be likely to need; and for theological students it is an excellent introduction and guide to the study of modern aberrations. A few thoughts suggested by the book will close this paper.

1. The antichristian school of modern thought is called Rationalistic. But this does not imply that Christianity either ignores or disparages reason. Man is a rational animal; and revelation presupposes reason. In fact revelation to man is impossible if man has not a reasoning faculty to which it can be directed. Having this endowment of reason man must use it. It is the greatest gift of God to man within the sphere of nature; as revelation is the greatest gift of God to man within the sphere of grace. The infidel could seek no greater triumph than the admission on the part of Christians that man must forego his reason in order to accept revelation. To dissever faith from reason, or to set the one over against the other in hopeless antagonism, is really the aim of all un-Christian philosophy. It was with no view to strengthen faith that Hume ended his *Essay on Miracles*, by saying that those who undertake a rational defense of Christianity are "either dangerous friends or disguised enemies;" adding the disingenuous sneer that "our most holy religion is founded on faith, not on reason: mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity." It is precisely the first task of reason to examine the evidences of the "veracity" of our religion. It is the glory of Christianity that "the whole of its religion is a reasonable service." After the verification of the evidences of Christianity, reason has the further task of apprehending

and connecting the truths given by Revelation; and this is the function of theology, as a science. Mansel, who really means to defend Revelation, does it the greatest disservice, in our judgment, by his assertion, that the use of reason in the exposition and defense of Revelation is dogmatism. He further asserts, in the very spirit of philosophical skepticism, that reason is no more competent to discern the bearings and relations of spiritual truths than to sit in judgment upon the ideas of Revelation themselves. Clearly, if this be true, theology, as a science, is impossible. The fullest use and the highest culture of reason is not only compatible with the Christian mode of thought, but is in fact imperatively commanded by it.

2. It is not wise, in the defense of Christian truth, to abridge the domain of reason, or to stigmatize its highest exercise, if kept within its proper domain, as Rationalism, in the bad sense which that word has acquired. It is as bad in policy as in criticism, to call Neander, for instance, or the author of *Ecce Homo*, Rationalists. The name should be applied only to those who apply reason to the criticism of Revelation in an unfriendly way and for hostile purposes. When a young student in a Romanist theological seminary begins to question any point of dogma, say transubstantiation, his tutor or confessor will promptly warn him against Rationalism. Theology is a science; and science is the work of human reason. The difference between the Rationalist and the believer lies more in the material upon which reason is to work, and in the limits of its field of operation, than in any use of reason itself. The orthodox doctrine is, that both in philosophy and theology the *first truths* are given, and that reason alone could never find them; the Rationalist asserts that a complete system of truth, or all the truth that man is capable of knowing, can be found by unassisted reason. It was Herbert of Cherbury who laid down the principle of the sufficiency of our natural faculties to form a religion for ourselves; and this is, really, the fundamental principle of infidelity. One of the chief tasks of Christian apologetics is to show that this principle is itself irrational.

3. The immediate issue of our times is that of the Person of Christ. All the questions of the older Deistic and Ration-

alistic controversies, such as the integrity of the Scriptures, the nature of inspiration, the possibility of miracles, etc., were but preliminary skirmishes before the close grapple at the main position of the battle-field. The Person of Christ is the very heart and center of the Christian system; it is fitting and necessary, therefore, that it should be the final center of the conflict between faith and unbelief. So long as the majestic figure of the perfect Man, the Son of God, remains, in its ineffable grandeur, at the head of the march of humanity, so long is Christianity master of the intellect, as well as of the heart of the human race. The old infidelity sought to deny the life of Christ entirely. On the failure of this attack the plan of the battle was changed, and instead of denying the historical character of Christ, the Rationalists simply sought to disenchant it by bringing its divine lineaments down to the ordinary forms of nature, or throwing them back into the dusky regions of mythology. Within the present age we have seen this effort also fail; and now the latest aim is to *explain* the grand life which could not be ignored, and cannot be degraded or disparaged. The great task of Christian theology therefore, in our time, is to set forth the Person of Christ, historically, so as to satisfy the intellectual as well as the moral demands of the age. The work has been well begun by Neander, Ullmann, and Lange in Germany, and by Pressensé in France; while in England, the author of *Ecce Homo* has furnished a fragmentary and imperfect, though magnificent contribution. But the challenge of Strauss and Rénan has yet to be completely answered, as we are sure it will be answered, by a Life of Christ, springing from the heart of the Church, in which all the demands of criticism, of history, and of faith shall be met and harmonized.

Art. II.—THE UNITED STATES AND METHODISM.

For eighteen hundred years the course of human history has been marked by many marvelous triumphs of the Christian faith. For the last three hundred and fifty years that faith has led the march of history among the most intellectual and powerful nations of the world. And for the last two hundred years that same faith in this western world has been helping to fuse heterogeneous populations, diverse in origin, habits, sentiments, and faith, into a national unity, and to shape that nation into a political organism which shall be expressive of the dictates of the most enlightened reason, in whatever pertains to justice between men, and comprehensive of the maturest results of political experiences, gathered from all lands and all ages, and which shall also be congenial and sympathetic with the purest aspirations and sentiments of the common heart of man. And the American Republic, although it is not now, and never has been, the full realization of the grand ideal of its founders, gives us larger and surer promises in these respects than have ever been given before to any people, inasmuch as it professes to found an empire for the first time in history on the inherent freedom and dignity of the individual man as against the clannish theory of government, such as has obtained in the class or despotic governments of ancient Europe, the priestly-military despotisms of old Egypt and Persia, the noble-family system of modern Europe, and the wretched caste system of India.

And to this good object the Christian Church has contributed greatly. Being released from its unchaste alliance with the civil power, it has with that release wrought the more powerfully on public opinion, and thereby infused Christian sentiments and Christian forms into the legislation and judicial processes of the country. Divorced from the state, its power as a voluntary institution far transcends its power as a state establishment. And, accordingly, it was the voluntary Church in the form of a Christian faith in the hearts and minds of the people, that saved for the American people their liberties and their civilization during the perilous times of colonization, revolution, and rebellion. So that it has at length come to

pass that the announced elements of a political philosophy are one with the ethics of the Bible, and thereby the nation has secured a lease upon its life, a stability for its political system, and a guarantee for its prosperity, commensurate however only with its fidelity to the Christian sentiments incorporated into its professed civil policy. Nations, like men, heretofore have died. There came decay or death, or both of these, because they obeyed the lust of conquest and not the love of justice; because they have declared and enforced, under pains and penalties, and by the oppressive fiction of prescriptive rights, certain unjust inequalities among men, and so have broken the Golden Law; because they have given themselves up to luxury, to usurping ambition, idleness, and ignorance, those prolific mothers of multitudinous evils, and thus have passed into a fatal decline, the tendency of which is read in the modern names of Spain, Turkey, India, and Mexico; and the end of which is read in those ancient memorial names of Assyria, Persia, Judea, Rome. Nations need not die. They may henceforth be as enduring as the world. Their birth may not be a feeble weakling infancy, nor their great age a decrepitude. The analogy between the successive stages of the individual life and that of a nation, answering to infancy, youth, manhood, and feeble age, is suggestive of apt illustrations of changes in human history, is full of philosophical truths and of scientific conceits, can express the truth and also be distorted into error. And this analogy, so often drawn, must not be held as even a poetic statement of a primordial, universal, immutable law, controlling the life of all nations past, present, and to come. National death, except by external violence, has usually been the result of national sins; and national life should be a perpetuated one, never declining into decrepitude; should be with bloom and strength attendant even in the greatest age. Such a national life will be the sure result of national righteousness and wisdom. The nation that liveth and believeth in Christ shall not die. The American Republic came near its death because of its individual, social, and political divergence from just and humane principles.

A branch of the Christian Church, called Methodism, which has within a century enlarged its living membership from six persons to upward of a million; which began its existence in

this country amid the agitations of the revolutionary times; which alone of all the denominations had growth and enlargement during the trials, losses, and stormy perplexities of that Revolution; which, being organized nearly at the same time with the organization of the Federal Republic, has since then kept pace with it almost step by step in its wonderful growth in numbers, wealth, culture, influence, energy, and prospective usefulness, and this too without a loss of spiritual life: such a Church may naturally be supposed to have characteristics in strong sympathy with the nation, and the above census-like similarities holding between them may be regarded as the outward signs of the inner kinship of common principles. Moreover, since this Church, exclusive of the Southern part, has under its control or patronage over one hundred academies, colleges, and theological seminaries; publishes yearly about 15,000,000 copies of periodicals, besides books and tracts; has a ministry counted by thousands, active, earnest, and christianly ambitious in their work; has a laity enterprising and successful in business, fervent in spirit and liberal in money, of notable repute in all the Churches for efficiency in religious work, good helpers of the great benevolent movements of society, coextensive with the world, yet locally operative on the individual; has an organization compact but flexible, consolidated by bishoprics, yet remarkably diffusive by its clerical and lay influence and agencies; which has done pioneer work among the masses of the people, such as no other denomination could have done, by bringing them to the cross, and lifting them up by that cross into a purer and a larger life, and which is daily increasing in numbers and power by incorporating into itself the best results of human culture, and the best methods of business enterprise; these, and other like facts, make the additional supposition likewise a natural one, that with such facilities and faculties for aggressive work, with such elements of a propagandist power, it will exercise no inconsiderable influence in giving both tendency and form, both tone and color, both impulse and balance, to the peculiar forms and spirit of our national life, which we, in contradistinction from those of other lands and other times, are pleased to call American Civilization.

It should be borne in mind that American history is not the

description of a new race of men, nor of a race appearing suddenly on this continent, like the irruption of the Arabs into Spain, or of the Greeks into Asia under the mad Macedonian. Nor is it the appearance here of ideas, customs, institutions, sciences, and laws much unlike those of Europe. Rather American history is the account of the transplanting of individuals and groups of men of the old races to new scenes of action; of men familiar with the history, the laws, the literature, the science, and the religion of the lands whence they came, but imbued, however, and attracted by the force of the ideal of a fairer and freeer humanity than could be realized under the despotic restrictions of the fatherlands. There was needed a new field of labor, wherein the hoarded accumulations of over two thousand years of European civilization could be profitably invested for the benefit of mankind; and a new scene of action, where could be inaugurated the new political era of the equal rights of all, and the new ecclesiastical era of the voluntary Church. A new continent was necessary for these newer and more humane thoughts, this freer and fresher social life. The new wine must have the new bottles.

But while the early settlers fled from the shores of the old world to escape the dead past and the oppressive present, nevertheless they found these both again on the shores of the new. Neither individuals nor nations can abruptly terminate their history. They cannot make sudden and reversive changes in the form and function of their organized life. The past lives on into the present, and the child is father to the man. The American nation had European and Asiatic progenitors, and therefore partakes of their virtues and vices. Stronger than ties of blood or birth are the bonds that bind the nations of the world into the unity of one mankind, and so enforce a like unity in all the evolutions of history. The nations of the present are bound by the links of an historic logic to the nations of the most remote antiquity, and accordingly Asia lives yet in Europe, and Europe and Asia live yet in America. The Gospel has abolished the pagan distinctions of caste and servitude, declaring that henceforth there should be neither bond nor free, and yet, in the week of prayer held one year ago throughout Protestant Christendom, the American Church referred by name to the servants of the family in such a way as to recall

unpleasantly to mind the olden times when servants were servile family appendages to patriarchal power. It was an unpleasant reminiscence of an ancient social despotism thrusting itself across two continents and nearly forty centuries into the new land and the new times of a professedly humanitarian social polity. Anomalies meet us at every turn in politics, society, and literature. American politics, theoretically democratic, permitted a hereditary servitude in living connection with a planter aristocracy, which is the lowest, basest form an aristocracy can take. The Puritans insisted strongly on the personal rights of property, yet, seemingly without a compunction of conscience, robbed the Indian of his. The Colonists announced the freedom of speech and of conscience, but persecuted for opinion's sake. There are laudations of popular knowledge, yet in some of the states there is opposition to public schools. Clearly we are yet in active connection with the better and baser forms of the old world civilizations. The inevitable African is with us corrupting our language, debasing our political parties, and proving the virtues of Christian men as they have rarely ever been proved before; and testing the loyalty of the Church to its founder's principles in such a way as to furnish the occasion for perhaps the saddest and quickest falling from grace known in ecclesiastical annals. The ends of the world have come confusedly and hostilely together in the meeting of the Chinese and Yankees in civil and industrial relations on the Pacific coast. German speculations and criticism infect the whole atmosphere of American thought, and our writers and thinkers are in a state of pupilage to German masters, reproducing their works, instead of writing new ones from the American standpoints of doctrine, practice, and habit. French tastes set our fashions, and New York is but a transatlantic dependency of Paris. If capricious Paris indulges in a whim, straightway New York and Boston and Philadelphia are whimsical too. English doctrines of political economy excite fluctuations in our manufactures and commerce. An Italian Papacy establishes its schools, builds cathedrals, erects and buys colleges among us, and then imports the Irish priest to preach in the one and to teach in the other. The Greek of the golden age of Pericles, and the Roman of the purer days of the Commonwealth, and of the semi-

barbaric days of the empire, as well as Shakspeare and Milton, and Newton and Faraday, still live in our schools and in our literature. The French assumption that "all men are born equal," yet lives in our Declaration of Independence as words of matchless power. The common law of England has become in large part our own common law. So true is it, that mankind, though separated by centuries and grouped into distinct nationalities, are not disconnected fragments of humanity; but everywhere and always in force there are the mystic ties of a primal oneness of blood, a oneness of heart and of mind, organizing the whole succession of human beings into the unity of an historical man.

Of such good and evil, old and new, elements, is American civilization composed. It has elemental antagonisms; is exceedingly diversified and complex, as an advanced civilization must be; nevertheless it has its peculiar features and excellences, making it so distinctive from all prior and contemporaneous civilizations, that it is worthy of giving a name to the latest epoch of human history. And, adopting the continent-theory of the progress of the race, we would say, that as Europe succeeded Asia, so is America succeeding Europe, and has accordingly named the present epoch the American age, or, to speak more humanely, the age of the people. And one of the characteristics of American life we shall call for convenience by the term Individualism, the full import of which can best be shown by a brief comparison of the fundamental natures and distinctions of ancient and modern society.

The social unit of ancient times was the family; that of modern is the individual. Ancient society was a group of families; that of modern, rather a collection of individuals. In the infancy of society a group of persons united by blood relationship, or by the fiction of adoption, whereby aliens were incorporated into the family and so entitled to all its privileges, was the source of rights and duties for the individual members of it. "Men are regarded and treated not as individuals, but always as members of a particular group. Everybody is first a citizen, and then as a citizen he is a member of his order—of an aristocracy or a democracy, of an order of patricians or plebeians; or, in those societies which an unhappy fate has afflicted with a special perversion in their course

of development, of a caste. Next he is a member of a gens, house, or clan; and lastly he is a member of his family, nor was he ever regarded in *himself* as a distinct individual. His individuality was swallowed up in his family."* The modern hereditary succession to titles and offices is a remnant of the archaic and barbaric civilizations. The houses of Hapsburg, of Bourbon, of Guelph, and others, are modern forms of the ancient notion of the family as the social unit and the source of privileges and power. And at this day books are written wherein the Percys, the Greys, the Stanleys, with twenty-seven other families, are formally styled "the governing families of England," as though the political and social status of men should be dependent upon membership in a family, instead of membership in the human race. It is the hateful pagan exclusiveness, instead of the humane modern and Christian political catholicity.

In the United States, however, not the family, but the individual is the unit of society; and the equality of the political status of all, theoretically, is based on the inherent, natural rights of the individual as representative of all men. But at the same time the family, or the social element, is not excluded; the individual is correlated with the social, and in this way society is on the one hand kept clear of the immobility and the tyranny, such as have hardened into an oriental system of castes, and on the other hand is saved from the capricious waywardness and follies of an overweening individualism. The true science of society, or sociology, must be based on the American doctrine of the equal natural rights of each man, in all the modes of human activity; and it receives its only just exposition in the adaptation of each person to all others in such relationships that his rights as a person, sole and individual, shall be recognized or conceded, apart from those rights and relationships pertaining to society. And the movements that constitute the progress of the race have this as a fundamental law, to wit: the growth of individual obligation in place of family dependency. And the philosophy of legal history is said to lie in the abatement of family pretensions and enforcements, and in the enlargement of individual rights and duties, apart from the accidents of birth or fortune. The word *nation*

* Maine's Ancient Law.

preserves in a remarkable manner the ancient notion of the family as the unity of society. All who were *born* in a family constitute it. Birth is the sole original family bond of relationship; and so, as among the Romans a group of families formed the house, or *gens*; a group of houses formed the tribe, a group of tribes the nation. The Jews were a nation because descended from one man, Abraham. It is true that the legal fiction of adoption, and the processes of legislation, and other means, made an alien or foreigner a member of a family, and hence of a nation; but it did this by counting him as possessed of blood relationship, and therefore the bond of birth was a real or implied one in primitive society considered as a nation.

It is against this accident of birth, and this class or clannish monopoly conferring peculiar privileges, or entailing peculiar detriments, that American civilization enters its active protest. Against it is the constitutional clause forbidding those relics of pagan and feudal barbarism, that treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except in the lifetime of the person attainted; against it is the present effort to remove all class and caste restrictions in regard to civil and political rights, and against it is the refusal to give votes to property instead of to persons; against it is the system of public schools, designed to give the rudiments of culture to all; against it is the facility for the acquisition and distribution of property, especially of land; against it is the magnificent spectacle of a voluntary Church working in love for the conversion of the world to Christ, and with an effectiveness unparalleled since the days of the Apostles. For it are the individual partisan movements looking to the permanent civil and political disability of all persons of the colored race; for it was the warm sympathy and active support given by Englishmen to the late rebels. It is the continuance of the pagan idea of the permanent disqualification of parts of mankind for certain higher duties and privileges; and the cognate idea of the family, or a class, or a clan, as the source of rights and powers. In patriarchal times, Abraham would have said, Do my servant no harm, for in so doing you trespass upon the rights of the family. Rome would have said, Do a Roman no harm, for in so doing you offend the majesty of the state. England says, Do a Briton no harm, for in so doing you offend the majesty of the law. America

says, Do the humblest citizen no harm, for in so doing you trespass upon the inalienable rights of man. And herein is the distinguishing and ennobling fact that lies at the basis of American civilization. It is the transition from family dependency to individual rights and duties. But the family or social idea is *not* set aside. On the contrary, social and family dependency coexist with. individual obligation and responsibility; and with this relation between them, that society exists for the individual, and not the individual for society. Societies and nations may die, but the individuals are immortal, and carry with them into the life beyond the social fruits of this. The long procession of human history, the labors and sufferings of reformers and martyrs, are only preliminary to the installation of a true democracy, wherein the individual shall be the units of the national life, and who by no statutory barriers, by no prescriptive impediments, shall be debarred from civil rights, from political privileges, from professional or industrial pursuits, or social advantages. Not the perfection of society only, but also, and mainly, the perfection of individuals, within and by help of society, is the great end toward which the issues of history unmistakably point.

In regard to Methodism, we find one characteristic feature of it to be that same strongly *individualized* life. As the political idea of the freedom and dignity of the individual has stamped the national life with the seal of a higher manhood, so the Christian idea of the direct, immediate, personal relationship of the individual soul to God, which Methodism has so clearly and pointedly proclaimed, has quickened the Church into unwonted activity in the missionary, the pulpit, and the educational labors of the last hundred years. We do not, of course, claim this Gospel truth as peculiarly Methodistic in any other way than in the peculiarly decisive emphasis with which Methodism has pronounced it in its doctrines, and cherished it in its sentiments, and cultivated it in its practical workings. It has always been a distinct feature of the Christian Church, and specially so of the Apostolic and Protestant Churches. It runs like a thread of golden light through the Gospels, placing them in striking contrast with the corporate dependency and relations of individuals under the pagan religions. Much of the power of the early Methodist preaching lay in the direct

personal appeals to the sinner, as though he was the only one that had need to flee from the wrath to come. And when, under the consciousness of sin, he tremblingly inquired, What must I do to be saved? he was directed, not to the Church, nor to the sacraments, nor to the means of grace, but to God's care for each soul as made known in the economy of salvation, and accordingly the words of counsel and comfort were, For *thee* Christ died. To the cultivation of this individualizing feeling, this vivid personal consciousness which enters so largely into American life, the peculiarity in doctrines, the experience meetings, the preaching, and the social life of Methodism contributed greatly. And for evidence of this we shall specially refer to the doctrinal standpoint in soteriology, or the relation of the divine to the human in the scheme of redemption. This relation of the human to the divine, or, more strictly, the part performed by human agency in salvation, may for our purpose be classed under three distinct conceptions, namely: the Churchly or Ceremonial; the Necessitated, or Foreign; and the Personal.

The Churchly idea finds its most perfect expression in the Papal system of religion. Salvation is received through the Church alone. It is the depository of divine grace and blessing, and outside of it there is no salvation. As the Jew, being a descendant of Abraham, was on that account a member of the Abrahamic family, and claimed peculiar rights as against the Gentile; and as the members of the patrician houses (*gens*) of ancient Rome claimed certain exclusive honors and privileges in virtue of their membership therein, so the Romanist claims special divine blessings in virtue of his membership in his ecclesiastical communion. Maximilian, the so-called emperor of Mexico, claimed to be within the line of succession to the throne of Austria in virtue of his acknowledged membership in the royal house of Hapsburg; so the Romanist expects to inherit eternal life mainly in virtue of his recognized connection with the Church. It is the ancient paganistic conception of the family or community as the source of rights and privileges, transferred to the Church. It is a species of ecclesiastical paganism that confounds the spiritual unity of the Church with the official, external unity of organization. With this ground view of the soteriological relation of man to God, accords the Popish

doctrine of the mass, whereby the individual in purgatory is saved by the action of the corporation to which he belonged on the earth; so also the peculiar interpretation of the unity and catholicity of the Church, of ordination, and of other doctrines and ceremonies, as found in the Romish Church.

Kindred with the Churchly is the Sacramental or ceremonial idea, in which stress is laid on a sacrament or a ceremony for the salvation of the soul. The Protestant Episcopal Church, and those Churches holding strictly to the Lutheran system of doctrines, furnish examples of this. In the former, according to high episcopal authority, any one, say a Greek from Constantinople, must, on application, be admitted into the Church if he believes in the Apostolic Creed, and has been baptized and confirmed. Here mere doctrinal assent, (which, according to Scripture, devils may give,) and a form of ceremonial compliance, give right and title to admission to membership in any branch of Christ's Church, without regard to the present moral or religious qualification of the individual applying for admission. In agreement with this, but going further in the same direction, is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, warranted by the words of the Articles of Religion. According to the Lutheran system, the person has only to place himself receptively in the means of grace, such as the preaching of the word, and the sacraments, and through these, as the divinely appointed channels of communication, there flow in some mystical manner into the soul, faith and justification and regeneration, thereby making the almost passive recipient a partaker of the divine nature. Kindred with this conception is the undue relative importance given to the sacraments, which in the Lord's Supper reaches out in the consubstantiational theory; and the overdrawn idea of the visible Church as an organism in which, and in virtue of its connection with which, each part receives its life. Here we have the strict communal idea exchanged for the ceremonial. The idea of exclusive corporate functions has been much abated, and the part performed by individuals much enlarged; still we are yet too far from the truly apostolic teaching in regard to the work of the individual in his own salvation. The individualism of the American life does not yet fully appear either in the Churchly or Sacramental notion.

In the Necessitated or foreign theory, or the High Calvinistic, the salvation of any one is made dependent on the free action of a divine selection made without reference to human faith or works, or anything in the creature, as cause or condition of the effectual calling of the individual to eternal life. The spiritual life is solely and arbitrarily a gift of sovereign grace. The soul is moved by a power *ab extra*, predetermining all its acts. The communistic or social idea is here replaced by that of a sovereignty, and individualism of character is only incidentally stimulated or encouraged. The scheme lacks the liberalism of American politics, as also the catholicity of Christianity. In logical connection with this view stand the peculiar views of the perseverance of the saints, and of free-will. How little this notion accords with the individualized catholicity, the equal-rights doctrine of our American civilization, needs not be pointed out.

In the Methodist belief, which involves the Personal theory, an emphasis unknown to the Calvinist, or the Lutheran, or the Papal, is laid upon man's own free action in the work of salvation. In the popular sentiments and professed creed of no other denomination is there so much stress laid upon the individual's free co-operative agency, personally considered, in reference to the divine influences whereby his salvation is secured. Election is conditioned on his acceptance of the offer of divine aid and grace. Reprobation is conditioned on his resistance to the grace and his refusal of the aid. The Church helps him to a higher life; but his membership in it is not the ground cause, nor the sole occasion, of his participancy in the divine blessings. The sacraments help him as means of grace, and as expressions and symbols of faith; but if deprived of the preaching of the word, of the sacraments, of Church fellowship, nevertheless if he in his own free action "hold himself receptively to the enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying inworkings of the Holy Spirit, then he will become holy both here and hereafter; but if he closes his heart against the same, he will continue in death both here and in eternity." This is the personal interpretation of soteriology. Stress is laid on the part performed by man. But while bringing into prominence the idea of the individual or personal, Methodism does not ignore by any means the social element, either in doctrine or practice. The Church is the communion of the

saints, ordained and established for the perfecting of the individual members thereof. Instead of subordinating the one to the other, Methodism rather co-ordinates them. It recognizes man as a social being, and that individualism pushed to an extreme of insulation is fatal to his welfare; therefore on the one hand it holds fast to the idea of a Church as an organized community, as a depository of blessings, and on the other it puts prominently forward the correlative idea of the purely personal relations of the individual soul to God. With the gospel doctrine of the distinct personality of God presented as a Father and Friend, there must be awakened a lively consciousness of the individual relationship to him. The Saviour taught specially the divine care for each one individually. It was a new doctrine then to the world, and stirred the heart as no other religion had stirred it before or could stir it, and it filled the soul with a sweet sense of the filial relation of the individual spirit to God the Father. And the Methodist revival was attended by this intensely individualized spiritual life. It formed a large part of the popular discourses and of the theological discussions. This Gospel individualism is both cause and effect of the "experience" of Methodists, in which not only benevolence to man and the glory of God; not only the prosperity of the Church, but also the power, peace, and joy within the soul, the rich sweet fruits of the spiritual life consciously enjoyed, were the objects aimed at. The soul thus thrown back upon itself, thus stimulated to religious self-culture, developed a strongly individualistic element in Methodism that is only paralleled in secular matters in the American Republic. A peculiar doctrine of Methodism, called Perfection, is a clear outgrowth of this religious experience, sharply defining itself under the stimulus of direct personal appeals such as have characterized Methodist preaching and doctrine. After justification, the convert is pointed to a state of adult growth, to a condition of spiritual strength and power over sin, whereby the law of love dominates in thought, feeling, and action. This personal nature of the relation of the human to the divine in the plan of redemption, involving a free-will agency and individual responsibility, when contrasted with the Churchly and Necessitated conceptions, serves in part to explain the rapid growth, the vigorous life, the aggressive

position, and the prospect for usefulness of the Methodistic branch of the Church of Christ.

There is another feature peculiar to American civilization, and to which Methodism has contributed in no small degree, and which is expressed by the phrase, the Age of the People, with which it is in entire harmony, save in a certain part of its governmental economy, wherein the laity are not included as members of its legislative assemblies. Yet even here their power is felt, and their influence and aid are sought, so that this antagonism to the genius and drift of American policy, this abnormal feature in American institutions, is more in form than in spirit. Moreover, the tendency of all changes in this direction is remedial of this defect, which was a necessity of Methodism in its early times, and alike honorable to the clergy and beneficial to the people. For the clergy, dealing with people who were mostly of the poorer, uneducated classes, and their Churches widely scattered and not strong in numbers, were compelled to assume the office of legislators as well as preachers, and what the circumstances of their early mission demanded of them we do not blame them for doing. There is a growing consciousness, however, that this anomaly of an oligarchic legislative system in a Church thoroughly republican in sentiment, and under republican political institutions, is not the form of Church government best suited for the work Methodism has yet to do. And Methodism, regarding no specific form of ecclesiastical government as exclusively of divine origin or sanction, and conceding validity to the diversities existing in the other denominations, is ready to change hers, so as to make the form suit the spirit, so soon as it is clear that a majority of her members are in favor of the change.

At the threshold of modern European civilization, historians find political power distributed among four classes: monarchs, nobles, clergy, and burghers or towns-people. These latter were the free people of certain municipalities or city-republics, such as were Pisa, Genoa, and Venice. These free cities have had an historical importance, inasmuch as they supply the transition movement whereby civil policy passed into a republican form, after having passed through the autocratic, monarchic, and oligarchic epochs of political history. For, origin

ally, no slavery or serfdom existed in these free cities. Slaves and serfs escaping thither, found freedom and remunerative employment in the manual labors and mechanic arts of the city, and in the agricultural occupations near it. They added to the wealth, thrift, and population of these city-republics. Two great ideas were involved in this European politico-social fact: one was the political equality of the citizens, and the other the honorableness of labor; and henceforth these two fundamentally democratic ideas were never lost, but have continued as parties, and even as war powers, in the conflicts that have marked the progress of the race in the most active theaters of the historical movements on the European and American continents. The destined triumph of the doctrine of civil equality, and the dignity of productive industry, in the future civil policy of the United States, is apparent to all who have been watching the progress and the gradual suppression of the great rebellion, which fought against these republican ideas with shot, and shell, and bayonet, and then, failing utterly in these, has now betaken itself, in the continuance of the contest, to the intrigues and the chances of the political arena. Civil equality, and the honorable character of labor, have been the burden of the great modern movements of society in favor of the masses. They name the present epoch the age of the people. Not the noble, not the clergy, not the burghers, but all these, and with these the mass of the people, in their entirety, constituting the source of power, and giving legitimacy to the functions of government, and at the same time, in harmony with this democratic idea, asserting the divine origin of civil government. In secular and in religious education, in the broadcast diffusion of knowledge among all classes of people, in the distribution and accumulation of wealth and comforts, in the remunerations and the productiveness of labor, the United States are confessedly the foremost nation of the world. And in this popular education, popular refinement and enrichment, lies the course of our manifest destiny, to which God's good providence has opened the way. For the toiling millions this, the genuine American civil policy, has the best words of cheer ever given to men.

And Methodism in its missionary work, in its itinerant system, in the practical working of its economic agencies, as

also in peculiar features of its theology, is here in analogy and in sympathy with the republic. Methodism has mightily helped to turn the social and political forces to the elevation of the common people. The Gospel free for all, and to be brought to all, whether rich or poor, bond or free, educated or unlettered, was its ruling purpose. It told the story of the cross in school-houses, in barns, by the wayside, in prisons, in court-houses, in market-places, in the streets and fields as well as in the churches, wherever the people could be reached. And our Methodist fathers preached with unwonted emphasis the doctrine of universal redemption, just as our political fathers proclaimed the universality of the rights of man. The poor had the Gospel brought to them.

Soon after the close of the Revolutionary war, there began that mighty exodus from the old world, of uneducated, semi-barbarous populations; and this incoming population, combined with the native one, made it an imperative duty that they should be religiously trained in order that the republic suffer no harm. And it is to the honor of Methodism, as it was congenial to its republican sentiments, that it supplied at that early day the urgent moral needs of the emigrant and lower native populations. A great burden of its mission was the religious training of the masses, and this it has done with such success, that the high position yet to be accorded in history to American civilization will be largely owing to the direct influence of Methodism in elevating the masses of the people. Not only the religious, but the literary culture of the people has been, and is, the aim of Methodism in fulfilling its world-mission of good to man. For proof that Methodism co-operates with the republic in establishing the age of the people, we need not now specially refer to the facts that an army of over thirty thousand students are being trained in our denominational institutions, and that a cheap and popular literature is diffused among the people under the impulse of that denominationally unrivaled Book Concern in New York, with its branches and depositories elsewhere; but we now simply refer to the significant fact that "Wesley was the first to set the example of the modern cheap prices for books, sustained by large sales;" working himself and inciting others to the work of simplifying to the popular comprehension, and of cheapening to their

means, the learning and the science of the day. The objection has been made to Methodism that it was and is unfavorable to educational efforts, especially in regard to its ministry. This objection can arise only from a misunderstanding of its spirit, its present labors in education, and from an ignorance of the facts of its previous history.

Moreover, like the nation, Methodism heretofore has sought chiefly the *diffusion* of knowledge; but now, like the nation, it is preparing itself for the *accumulation* of knowledge. Nationally, we have had much repute, at home and abroad, for bringing education within the reach of the humblest and poorest. Henceforth, by public aid and voluntary gifts, the accumulation of knowledge is also the aim of the public thought. The endowment and enlargement of the course of study in our institutions of learning point unmistakably to the time, nor far distant, when to the American university students shall come from foreign lands to complete their studies, particularly in the departments of natural science, and in the theory and practice of the mechanic and industrial arts, leaving, it may be, to the old world pre-eminence in philology, in speculative philosophy, and textual criticism. We soon shall divide with Europe authority in matters of physical science, which are essentially republican in their spirit and tendency. Lord Derby translates Homer for the purpose, perhaps, of helping to interpose a classical barrier, whereon the impulses of republican fervor may break and waste themselves. Louis Napoleon writes the life of Cæsar to help revive the failing authority of monarchies, and to give a good name to the despotic usurpations of individuals. But Agassiz labors in physical science, and his contributions thereto, diffused as knowledge, become a power among the people.

The impulse and the aim of the nation for the accumulation of knowledge finds a sympathetic accord and a practical co-operation in the present movements of the Methodist Church, by which it seeks for the endowment of its colleges, in order that the highest and ripest culture in science and literature, joined with pureness and morality and soundness of faith, shall be the standard of Methodist education. Then beyond this, to add to the existing stock of knowledge in the shape of additions to literature and contributions to science, is a

strong impulse moving the heart of Methodism to make its institutions of learning equal to the work set for them to do, which is to help in the conversion of the kingdoms of the world into commonwealths of learning, and virtue, and pure religion.

Henceforth there must be accumulation as well as diffusion of knowledge. And in this the voluntary Church of America is no failure, but rather a splendid and unexpected success, for by it have been secured to men, for their comfort and happiness in this life, those educational establishments, hospitals and eleemosynary homes, which are the monuments of piety and mercy. It has filled the land with churches, and crowded the schools with scholars, and it will forever save this nation from the debauchee fate that met imperial Rome.

With the ideas of a civil policy founded on the equal and *inalienable* rights of all men, and of the individual as the social unit, which American republicanism has permanently established in history and will propogate among the nations, there is another cognate with these, and also supplementary of them, to wit, the idea of Toleration. In a state based on the freedom and dignity of the individuals composing it, there must be toleration. For freedom, in a society constituted out of human nature as it now is, implies the absence of uniformity in sentiments, ideas, and modes of action. With the right of private judgment, there cannot yet be agreement in opinions. Individuals may be believers in monarchy, in oligarchy, in slavery, in state-religious establishments, in Mormonism; yet their private opinion is utterly ignored by the laws of the land, which offer no legal barrier to positions of honor, trust, or profit. Hence the free press, the free pulpit, the free forum, and the free professions generally. The progress of this intellectual liberty has been slow. But this republic offers to the world the imposing and admirable spectacle of a political unity coexisting with the right of private judgment and the tolerance of a consequent diversity of opinions. The American principle is, errors of opinion and judgment are best corrected by truth left free to oppose them. This mental freedom, which, as a practical fact, we call toleration, is one element of priceless value in our political system, and it distinguishes the new world civilization from all others in the *degree*, though not in

the fact, of this toleration. There are points, however, essential to national unity and national life; and when opinions diverse from these become openly and actively hostile to them, then no toleration can be allowed. Coercive suppression must be employed, not to destroy the right of private judgment, but to restrain its wrongful exercise.

This political toleration or liberalism has close analogy and counterpart in Methodist catholicity. Wesley boasted, and his boasting was the devout expression of warm Christian admiration: "One circumstance is quite peculiar to the people called Methodists; that is, the terms upon which any persons may be admitted into their society. They do not impose in order to their admission any opinions whatever. Let them hold particular or general redemption, absolute or conditional decrees. . . . They think and let think. One condition, and one only, is required, a real desire to save their souls. . . . Is there any other society in Great Britain or Ireland that is so remote from bigotry? that is so truly of a Catholic spirit? so ready to admit all serious persons without distinction." Again he says: "I do not know any other religious society, either ancient or modern, wherein such liberty of conscience is now allowed or has been allowed since the days of the apostles. Here is our glorying, and a glorying peculiar to us." *

American Methodism, however, has drawn the lines of admission into the communion of the Church somewhat more strictly. A specific assent to the doctrines of the Church is required of the clergy as a functional qualification for their office; but in regard to the admission of members into the Church, the rules require that "satisfactory assurances be given by the applicants as to the correctness of their faith." Now these "satisfactory assurances" are intended to be, not a formal subscription to the articles of religion, but rather a method of inquiry as to the applicant's soundness of faith in the general principles of religion, and as furnishing the occasion, if need be, to correct any unsoundness of faith which might work damage to the Christian character. A desire "to flee from the wrath to come" is the fundamental condition of admission into the Methodist Church, from which members can not be excluded simply for opinion's sake, while exhibiting

* Stevens's Centenary of American Methodism.

evidences of real piety, and conforming to the discipline of the Church. They can be excluded only for such "defects as exclude from the kingdom of grace and glory." "They can be tried and expelled for sowing dissension in the societies by inveighing against their doctrines and discipline; that is, not for their opinions, but for their moral conduct respecting their opinions. . . . This interesting historical fact is full of significance as an example of that distinction between *indicatory* and *obligatory* standards of theological belief which Methodism has perhaps had the honor of first exemplifying among the leading Churches of the modern Christian world."* And Methodism holds the most advanced position in the movement toward religious liberty becoming the common law of the civilized world. This Methodistic catholicity is at one with the political liberalism of the nation.

The American people have introduced into history the age of the people, and the people hold in their hands the destinies of the future. The nation now stands just beyond the threshold of this new age, strong in the strength of dominant democratic ideas. It has successfully passed one fearful period of peril, and lo, another threatens it. The perils of treason and slavery are over, and the perils from the sudden emancipation of millions of the dusky slaves will, we trust, also soon abate; but the great perils of foreign immigration are yet to come. The old centers of exodus in Europe will, in the next ten years, send us emigrant laborers by far outstripping the proportionate numbers they have sent before. And from other lands, whence heretofore only stragglers came, and they few and far between, hereafter they will come by companies, sensibly swelling the vast immigrant tides pouring themselves eagerly into the new country of landed homesteads, of household comforts and good wages. From all Europe and the ocean islands they will come. And these new comers will not be the educated, the refined, the religious, lovers of social order and of morality, understanding our institutions and upholding our liberties; but in large part rude, vicious, ignorant, slaves of the lower passions, and fit tools for the uses of political demagogues, and so needing moral and intellectual training to make them fit for American citizenship. But not only from the East, but from the

* Stevens's Centenary of American Methodism.

West, from the seaboard and central Asia, from those oldest lands of human history, the incoming population will swell to hordes of pagan barbarians. American civilization and population in thin lines and scattered forces have reached the Pacific, and there they are halting while securing their communications with their eastern home, and consolidating their forces preparatory to pushing across the Pacific into Asia. And when these things have been done, then, as from overcrowded hives, the Asiatic laborers will swarm into this comparative paradise of the laboring classes. And these pagan barbarians, brutified by centuries of oppression, and toil, and ignorance, and crime, and lust, will they not put in peril our civilization and our liberties? But where we see the danger, there lies our duty; and the duty of the Church is to supply the religious and intellectual needs of these debased and mistrained masses of humanity. Nobly has she sprung to her work, to meet the pressing wants of the liberated slaves in the southern states; and not less nobly nor less promptly will she rise to the work in this new field of labor, vast and sublime enough to excite the best efforts of a Christian philanthropy and heroism. On Methodism rests a solemn responsibility to do its share in civilizing and Christianizing these pagans, the hundred thousand of whom now with us in the West will increase to millions so soon as the lines of commerce are fairly established between the Pacific and Asiatic ports. And to Methodism, in view of its past history, its present numbers, and its peculiar mission as a Church, more than to any other denomination, perhaps, will come the imperative summons of trust and duty to see to it that the Republic receive no harm from this source. In the coming peril from the emigrants, the nation will lean upon the Church for strength and help; and our confident hope is, that as westward the course of civilization has taken its way around the world, so from the seat of American civilization westward it shall again follow the sun, blessing all lands with its light of truth and its privileges of freedom.

Art. III.—ADAM CLARKE AS A PREACHER.

Preaching is God's ordinance for the subjugation of rebellious men to his supreme authority. In this his wisdom is manifest. He knew what is in man, and hence the best method of conveying instruction to his mind. The painter pleases the eye, the musician charms the ear, the poet gratifies the imagination, the historian expands the understanding, and the biographer moves the affections. But the preacher unites in himself all these diversified powers. To him, the eye, the ear, the mind, the imagination, and the affections are all accessible.

Adam Clarke as a writer is extensively and favorably known by his valuable Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, and other able literary productions, both in the old world and the new. As a preacher he is not so well known. His writings have been circulated and read where his living voice has not been heard. We think he shined pre-eminently in the pulpit, as an embassador of Christ. With most of the distinguished British preachers, for the last half century, we have been personally acquainted. We only refer to those to whose voice we have listened, and on whose countenance we have looked. Many of these excelled Clarke in some of the characteristics of great preaching. He had not the irresistibleness of Joseph Benson, the loftiness of Richard Watson, the logical tact of Edward Hare, the quick perception of Jabez Bunting, the imagination of Richard Treffry, the oratory of Robert Newton, the satirical power of James Everett, the brilliancy of Joseph Beaumont, the elaboration of James Dixon, the sermonizing skill of John Hannah, the direct force of John Smith, nor the scintillation of John W. Etheridge. Yet Clarke possessed a larger assemblage of the properties of a great preacher than any of these eminent men. This may not appear from his published sermons, though many of these are among the best in our language; but they were chiefly written when he was advanced in life, at the request of friends, for posterity, and when quietly seated in his study, and contained matter never given in the pulpit. There the student was transformed into the preacher, and was less critical, less formal, but far more free, ample, fervent, and

powerful. To give the reader a correct view of Clarke's preaching, we remark that it was:

1. *Extemporaneous.* He never took a manuscript into the pulpit to read to his hearers. Such a mode of address he deemed unnatural, and calculated to defeat the great object of preaching. Nor did he deliver a discourse from memory. This he regarded as too mechanical, unfavorable to emotion, and requiring too great a consumption of time. He preached ten thousand sermons without knowing beforehand a single sentence that he should utter. Study, meditation, and prayer were his only preparation. He did not attempt to reduce preaching into the rules of science, and to learn the art of it. He once remarked to a brother minister, "I bless Jesus Christ I have never *learned* to preach; but through his eternal mercy I am taught from time to time by him as I need instruction. I cannot *make* a sermon before I go into the pulpit, therefore I am obliged to hang nakedly on the arm and wisdom of the Lord. Yet, I read a good deal, write very little, and strive to study; but these things I know will be of no avail, either to myself or the people, if they are unsealed by the Holy Ghost. A preacher who depends on his collections, divisions, and articulations, is highly despicable in the sight of God." Again he wrote: "Give up your endless writing of sermons, and torturing your mind by committing so much to memory. Preach from your knowledge of God, from your experimental knowledge of divine things; from Christ dwelling in your heart by faith; from the cloven tongue of fire which God has given you; then your ministry will be tenfold more blessed than ever. Let those who can do no better deal in their mouldy Gibeonitish crusts, and while they are bringing forth their old things, bring forth your things new and old; such new things as give spirit to the old, and such old things as give credit to the new."

And the following extract from one of his private letters is worthy the serious consideration of all engaged in the ministry: "As to your *making* or *composing* sermons, I have no good opinion of it. Get a thorough knowledge of your subject; understand your text in all its connection and bearings, and then go into the pulpit depending on the Spirit of God to give you power to explain and illustrate to the people those general

and particular views which you have already taken of your subject, and which you conscientiously believe to be correct and according to the word of God. But get nothing by heart to speak there, else even your *memory* will contribute to keep you in perpetual bondage. No man was ever a successful preacher who did not discuss his subject from his own *judgment* and *experience*. The *reciters* of sermons may be *popular;* but God hardly ever employs them to convert sinners, or build up saints in their most holy faith. I do not recommend in this case a blind reliance upon God; taking a text which you do not know how to handle, and depending upon God to give you *something to say*. He will not be thus employed. Go into the pulpit with your understanding full of light, and your heart full of God, and his Spirit will help you; and then you will find a wonderful *assemblage of ideas* coming in to your assistance; and you will feel the benefit of the doctrine of *association*, of which the *reciters* and *memory-men* can make no use. The finest, the best, and the most impressive thoughts are obtained in the pulpit, when the preacher enters it with the preparation mentioned above."

The doctor fully carried out his own rules. In his notes on Daniel ii, 41–45, he has given the outline of a sermon on Nebuchadnezzar's dream. He was one hour and forty minutes in its delivery, for the Methodist Missions, in City Road Chapel, London. We were present on the occasion, and to a more extraordinary discourse we never listened. When asked how it was possible to get through, without notes, a sermon embodying so much of chronology, history, geography, and divinity, he replied, "I had the whole before me as clear as the noonday; I felt as if I was standing *on* the world, not in it; it was all spread before the eye of my mind. I saw it all, and therefore I could describe it all; and I felt, while I was dwelling on the power of God, and on his mercy, as revealed in Christ for the salvation of man, as if I was taking hold of the pillars of eternity, and on them I hung the truth of God, which never can be shaken, and his mercy which it declared, and which can never know an end."

When a gentleman, who had on a certain occasion heard him in Bristol, said, "That sermon must have cost the doctor great labor," he replied, "It cost me just half an hour." Now, un-

less his preaching is judged by the circumstances in which he appeared in the pulpit, justice is not done to him. I knew a popular preacher who, it was said, took six months to prepare a discourse. Men of this class, bending the whole of their strength to the work, may have *got up* as finished a discourse as Clarke in general gave; but we have known no preacher who, without having written a word, could go into the pulpit on the shortest notice, and pour forth such a torrent of important matter, and all flowing out of the text, as he did. Extemporaneous preaching has certainly many advantages over the other modes. It is better calculated to arrest the attention and to enkindle the sympathies of the hearers; the speaker is then more fully prepared to receive help from the Holy Spirit, to address his audience with greater freshness and heartiness, and to seize, for their benefit, passing thoughts, and impressions, and occurrences. After preaching one day in City Road Chapel, London, a friend remarked to him, "I could not but observe that in the sermon you seemed suddenly to quit the subject in hand and fly off to a series of arguments in proof of the divinity of our Saviour. Had you any reason for so doing?" "Yes," said he, "I observed Dr. K., a celebrated Socinian, steal into the back part of the chapel, and after a few minutes plant his stick firmly as if he intended to hear me out. So, by God's help, I determined to bear my testimony to the divinity of our Lord, trusting that he would touch his heart, and give him another opportunity of hearing and receiving the truth."

2. *Expository.* His first object was fully to understand his text, then to give its literal sense, taking special care always to draw the spiritual meaning from the literal. He was careful to explain both the things of God, and the words of God. He never took a text which out of its proper connection has no meaning; nor a very short text, lest man should be heard more than God; nor an allegorical text, which cannot safely be used to support any doctrine; nor would he treat a passage in a way that seemed to contradict the Holy Spirit; not handling the word of God deceitfully; but, by manifestation of the truth, commending himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. He had a painful sense of his responsibility, which frequently drank up his spirit and made his soul tremble. His manner and method were different from those of others; he

followed no man, and it would be difficult for any one to follow him. He despised all artificial aid for producing effect. He commenced the service by giving out a few verses in a clear, distinct, and full voice. After singing he offered a short prayer, distinguished by a holy and reverential boldness, as if he spoke to one with whom he was familiar. He then uttered his text; and in simple, yet forcible language, gave some general information connected with his subject, or laid down some general positions. He never announced his plan, though, as he gradually unfolded it, intelligent hearers could not fail to discover it; and this was not done with the formality of division and subdivision—"the three heads and a conclusion." The whole was free and easy, as he pursued the track which the subject seemed to suggest, and poured forth an unbroken stream, deep, full, clear, and refreshing, and without apparent effort. Though his plan was mostly expository, yet it was not stiff or abrupt. He took a broad view of the truths of the sacred volume, and showed the bearing of one part upon another, and the relations of each part to the whole. Not a word of importance would escape his notice, or be permitted to pass without explanation, yet all he said appeared perfectly natural. His sermons were not topical, but textual. He gave the meaning of God's word, and applied it to the consciences of his hearers. His knowledge of Scripture was so thorough, his discernment of things that differ so clear, his power of collecting and combining scattered parts so great, that it was easy to see their connection, relation, and dependence, while the greatest variety was kept up in his pulpit addresses. When in London, a respectable Methodist, warmly attached to the doctor, accompanied him for three years to his preaching places; and on being asked by Benson whether he had not become tired with hearing the same sermons so often, replied that he had never heard the same discourse twice, except on one occasion, when it was repeated at his own request. "Well," returned the inquirer, "if you did not hear the same text, did he not take the same subject?" "No, not anything beyond the broad Gospel of Jesus Christ." We may here remark, that as there is such a loud and general call at the present time for intellectual preachers, that he is the most intellectual preacher who gets most easily, readily, and directly

to the hearts of his hearers, enlightening, convincing, and subduing them to the obedience of Christ; he who can best explain and enforce the great subjects of the glorious Gospel.

3. *Plain.* Marked by great simplicity and perspicuity. He employed no high-sounding words, gaudy metaphors, or pompous periods; he never adopted a word for the sake of its music, nor was delighted with the rhythm of a copious sentence; never sacrificed clearness to any prettiness or favorite form of expression. He rejected all embellishments which did not make his subject more clearly apprehended and impressive. There was the most perfect naturalness. He was full of great thoughts, and impatient to utter them, without any solicitude about the words in which they were conveyed. He spoke out of the abundance of the heart; and if his sentences were often peculiarly appropriate to the subject, they never left the impression on the hearers that they had been sought out with labor and care. There was no artifice or love of display. His style was easy and artless, and so found a way at once to the heart. He was ever more concerned about things than words, and that the meaning should strike than that the expression should be striking. He adapted his sermons to the character, capacity, and circumstances of his hearers, and so interested them in the subject that they thought nothing about the style. His object was not to tickle the ears, amuse the fancy, or excite a smile, but to move the heart, and save a soul from death. He could condescend to men of low estate; bring down lofty subjects to ordinary understandings, and thus elevate their minds and ennoble their character. His learned criticisms were often understood by the unlearned. The common people heard him gladly. Here is a proof that he was not "hard to be understood." When in Shetland, a poor woman, who had heard of his celebrity, went to hear him preach. On her return home she remarked with great simplicity, "They say that Dr. Clarke is a learned man, and I expected to find him such; but he is only like another man, for I could understand every word he said."

4. *Instructive.* His exposition was as comprehensive as it was clear. His Oriental researches, his biblical and general knowledge, were extensive, and to these he frequently made excursions to present his subject in all its bearings, laying

heaven and earth, nature and art, science and reason, under contribution to sustain his cause. He took up the precious ore as it lay in its original bed; and by such a disposition of its several parts, and such a powerful handling of it as a whole, compelled myriads to acknowledge its heavenly worth and origin, and to sink and quiver under its searching power. The Bible to him was an inexhaustible storehouse, with every part of which he sought to be familiar; and when in the pulpit his personal experience of the things of God, and his ample stores of learning, were all called into requisition. He possessed a remarkable power of selecting from his stores, almost at once, the suitable materials for the occasion, which he poured forth with energy and freedom. He kept the fountain full, knowing that at his bidding it would flow; and by his commanding genius he could give the proper measure and direction to the streams. He was a scribe well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, that brought forth out of his treasure things new and old. In every sermon he explained some doctrine, or duty, or privilege. He felt that his commission was to turn men from darkness to light; to enlighten those whose views of the subject were erroneous, and to confirm and enlarge the views of the better instructed. He disliked controversy, and never took the attitude of debate; but, as one set for the defense of the Gospel, he would occasionally meet an objection and satisfactorily answer it. But he delighted more in the exhibition of truth, and would present it in aspects so attractive as did not fail to arrest the attention and excite the admiration of his hearers for their instruction and general improvement. And though he brought to every subject a mind richly stored, he carefully avoided prolixity. He knew when to stop. He left off when he had done.

5. *Evangelical.* He not only taught scriptural truth, but gave great prominence to the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. Christ Jesus the Lord was the great subject of his ministry; the subject to which all other subjects refer, and with which they are all intimately connected. He viewed the Saviour as the central orb of the system, around which all the other parts revolve, and from which they derive their beauty and bright ness, connection and harmony, influence and energy. Christ, in the proper divinity of his person, underived, independent,

and immutable; arrayed in all the splendors of the Godhead, possessed of infinite, harmonious, and glorious perfections: Christ, in his unparalleled condescension, mysterious incarnation, spotless life, sacrificial death, triumphant resurrection, magnificent ascension, and all-prevalent intercession: Christ, in all the great offices which he sustains, as the infallible prophet, the exclusive priest, the supreme legislator, the sole mediator, and the final judge: Christ, as an all-sufficient, willing, suitable, and general Saviour of mankind, ready to receive all who come unto him. This was the theme on which he delighted to dwell. He gave to all other truths an evangelical application. Convinced that "to man the bleeding cross hath promised all," he was determined to know nothing among men save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. He ascended Calvary, lingered around the cross, drew arguments from its pain and shame, stood in tears before the sepulchre, explored earth, emptied heaven, and drained hell, for motives to induce the sinner to come to the Saviour.

6. *Experimental.* He passed from the person to the work of Christ; and from what he had done *for* us to what he would do *in* us; that all he has done for us is in reference to what he is to do in us; that he died, and revived, and now liveth, that he may dwell in our hearts, there erect his throne, establish his kingdom, sway his scepter, defeat his enemies, plant his graces, carry on his triumphs, until he has brought every thought into subjection to his law. He was quite at home on all these subjects. Each sermon was the genuine language of his heart; he spoke his own thoughts, and expressed his own feelings. He laid it down as a maxim, that the hearers are not likely to feel unless the preacher feels. Like priest, like people. So we preached, and so ye believed. We know of no preacher that has given such prominence in his ministry to the illimitableness of the mercy of God, the universality of redemption by Jesus Christ, the direct witness of the Holy Spirit to the fact of the believer's adoption into the divine family, and to the doctrine of entire sanctification. A sermon of his was looked forward to by sensible pious persons, as a rich feast. The saintly William Edward Miller, on one occasion as Clarke descended from the pulpit, stepped forward, flung his arms around the doctor's neck, wept a flood of tears, and said,

"Bless you! you are a man of God, full of faith, and full of the Holy Ghost!" The excellent Mrs. Mortimer wrote: "I have had some cheering views, as well as happy experiences, of the nature and power of faith; some valuable sermons of Mr. Adam Clarke have helped me in this respect. He is an excellent preacher, and much beloved by all who hear him."

7. *Practical.* He enforced Christian duties, though not so minutely and separately as some preachers. He took care to show that the love of Christ is the mainspring of all holiness, the motive and reason of all obedience. The doctrines he preached practically, the duties he preached doctrinally. He kept back no part of the truth, but declared the whole counsel of God. After preaching in London, one Sabbath morning, on the duties that should guide men of business, an eminent merchant, who had heard the sermon, overtook him on the way home, and observed, "Mr. Clarke, if what you have said to-day in the pulpit be necessary between man and man, I fear few commercial men will be saved." "I cannot help that, sir," replied he; "I may not bring down the requirements of infinite justice to suit the selfish chicanery of any set of men whatever. It is God's law, and by it he will himself judge man at the last day." On another occasion, when some observations were made relative to a collection for a charity, an old gentleman, possessed of considerable property, being present, devoutly wound up the business with, "The love of money is the root of all *evil*." The doctor replied, "If you think so, you may hand me over a few of your bags, and I will soon show you that I can do some *good* with them." In the following admirable observations to a brother minister, he strikingly shows the object he himself kept constantly in view, and the method he regularly adopted. "The only preaching worth anything in God's account, and which the fire will not burn up, is that which labors to convict and convince the sinner of his sin, to bring him into contrition for it, to convert him from it, to lead him to the blood of the covenant, that his conscience may be purged from its guilt, to the Spirit of judgment and burning, that he may be purified from its infection, and then to build him up on his most holy faith, by causing him to pray in the Holy Ghost, and keep himself in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life. This is

the system pursued by the apostles; and it is that alone which God will own to the conversion of sinners. I speak from the experience of nearly fifty years in the public ministry of the word. This is the most likely mode to produce the active soul of divinity, while the body is little else than the preacher's creed. Labor to bring sinners to God, should you by it bring yourself to the grave."

8. *Affectionate.* Love to the souls of his hearers seemed to glisten in his eyes, light up his countenance, and flow from his lips. It carried him with the force of a torrent. He travailed in birth for them. He was willing to impart to them not the Gospel of God only, but his own soul also. It constrained him to brave the tempests that rage around "the naked melancholy isles, placed far amid the northern main." He never doubted his commission to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty them that are bruised. He was once preaching on the love of God, and toward the conclusion of his discourse he gave a sweep to his arm, drawing it toward himself, as though he had collected in it several objects of value, and then throwing them, like alms, in the full bounty of his soul, among the people, "Here," he said, "take the arguments among you; make the best of them for your salvation. I will vouch for their solidity; I will stake my credit for intellect upon them. Yes, if it were possible to collect them into one, and suspend them as you would suspend a weight on a single hair of this gray head, that very hair would be found to be so firmly fastened to the throne of the all-merciful and ever-loving God, that all the devils in hell might be defied to cut it in two."

The intelligent Mrs. Pawson, who sat for five years under his ministry, gives this vivid description: "Brother Clarke is an extraordinary preacher, and his learning confers great luster on his talents; he makes it subservient to grace. His discourses are highly evangelical; he never loses sight of Christ. In regard to pardon and holiness, he offers a present salvation. His address is lively, animated, and very encouraging to the seekers of salvation. In respect to the unawakened, it may indeed be said, that he obeys that precept, 'Cry aloud; spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet.'

His words flow spontaneously from the heart; his views enlarge as he proceeds; and he brings to the mind a torrent of things new and old. While he is preaching, one can seldom cast an eye on the audience without perceiving a melting sensation resting on them. His speech distills as the dew, and as the small rain upon the tender herb. He generally preaches from some part of the lesson for the day; and on the Sabbath morning, from the Gospel for the day; this method confers an abundant variety on his ministry."

We have then the evidence that he kept back nothing that he thought would be profitable unto the people; even when he has had nobles and princes among his hearers, such as the Duke of Kent, the father of the beloved queen of England, and his brother, the Duke of Sussex. He preached the law to make way for the gospel; would pluck the blazing lightnings and pealing thunder of Sinai, and flash and roll them among his hearers, throw around them the scenes of the final judgment, and uncover the pit where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, if by any means he might save them from the bitter pains of eternal death. He made many a Felix tremble, and many a Festus start from his seat, exclaiming, "Thou art beside thyself, much learning hath made thee mad;" and many an Agrippa confess, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." If genius is "impassioned wisdom," Clarke had energies allied to it. He had a thrilling and absorbing sense of his subject. His was often the eloquence of condensed thought in condensed expression. "How is it," said a bishop to a player, "that your performances, which are but pictures of the imagination, produce so much more effect than our sermons, which are all realities?" "Because," said the player, "we represent our fictions as though they were realities, and you preach your realities as though they were fictions." Not so Clarke. He was not dull, cold, statue-like, lulling his hearers to sleep by the opiate of a passionless monotony, but ever displayed intense devotedness, deep earnestness, in his tones, looks, and whole manner. He felt the weight of souls, was in earnest for their salvation, persuading, entreating, beseeching them to be reconciled unto God. But there was nothing harsh or austere, boisterous or repelling in his manner.

He went from his closet to the sanctuary, and there getting a renewal of his commission, he entered the pulpit with the authority to execute it in his heart. Everything was conducted with solemnity. He avoided all fantastic attitudes, queer noddings, absurd stoopings, ever feeling that he was in the presence of God, and preaching for eternity; more anxious to win the souls of his hearers than their admiration; to excel in the spirit and power of his sermon than in its mechanism, to have it filled with the breath of heaven, than to have it exactly formed bone to bone. Not satisfied even with walking about Zion, telling her towers and marking her bulwarks, he entered her courts, and approached the fire that burned on her altars.

9. *Powerful.* For half a century no preacher in England was more popular than Adam Clarke, obtained larger congregations, or secured better collections. How shall we account for this? Not to anything so remarkable in his personal appearance, though it was dignified, and his bearing noble; his limbs were symmetrical, chest broad, eyes small and brilliant, forehead lofty, back over which his silver locks, in beautiful contrast with his ruddy complexion, were thrown, giving to the countenance additional openness. We do not ascribe his popularity and success to any flowers of rhetoric or witcheries of elocution. He had a ready utterance and an extensive vocabulary; a strong and clear voice, though a little monotonous, and the tones of which he could not always manage; while his action might not, in every instance, be considered graceful by fastidious hearers. He was blessed with a mind naturally active and vigorous, searching and comprehensive, formed for investigation, capable of grappling with difficulties, remarkable for its patient application, and possessed a singular ability for penetrating, arranging, and generalizing subjects; more adapted for analysis than synthesis. He had a remarkable power of acquisition; his memory was accurate and capacious. He attended to the advice he had received from Wesley: "Never forget anything you have learned." He never lost his relish for reading and study, and his stores accumulated to the close. A few pedants, with not the twentieth part of his learning, have had the boldness to affirm that he was not a great scholar. Samuel Drew well remarked, "Dr. Clarke is an eagle that in his towering flight cannot be

overtaken by birds of an inferior order, and must therefore be shot." But we are not called on here to speak of his learning. We are viewing him as a preacher. As such, to us, he was not surpassed. To his many other excellences we add his great energy. This flowed from deep conviction and ardent feeling. As he proceeded with his sermon, he condensed his strength and became more animated; the certainty of his own mind, and the convinced feelings of his own heart, were shown by the firm confidence of the tone, and a certain fullness of voice and emphasis of manner. His soul caught fire, his sensibilities were excited, and his sympathy with his hearers could not fail to arouse their feelings. An extraordinary influence attended his word, which, while it enlightened the minds, penetrated, warmed, moved, and enraptured the hearts of the myriads who had the privilege to sit under his ministry. Let me give one instance. In 1825, on a Sunday morning, walking to the chapel where the doctor was about to preach, he asked the loan of Wesley's Notes on the New Testament, which I usually carried in my pocket. The place was crowded, the front seats of the gallery chiefly with preachers. When he had given out the text—"Rejoice evermore. Pray without ceasing. In everything give thanks"—he commenced by saying: "I shall just read to you the notes of Mr. Wesley on these verses;" which, having done, he proceeded calmly to expound the text. As he advanced he warmed, and was as the sun when he goeth forth in his strength. The influence descended, the congregation felt it; were deeply moved. Many rose from their seats. The preacher said, "I feel as if I could draw all your souls to God." Great was their rejoicing. Jabez Bunting, who was in the pulpit, had to preach that evening in the same chapel. I was present. He gave his favorite sermon, founded on Rom. viii, 17, but it would not go. No unction seemed to attend it. He felt it, and in the middle of his sermon abruptly uttered the exclamation, "O that I could but have the influence and hold of you that the venerable man had who addressed you in the morning!"

If the description we have given is deemed too laudatory, it affords us pleasure to confirm it by the testimony of competent witnesses. The first we adduce is that of the amiable James Montgomery: referring to sermons Clarke had delivered

in Sheffield but three months previous to his death, he said in a large assembly, "Who among us does not remember, nay, which of us can forget, those two discourses—the simple energy with which they were poured forth, the unction of the Holy One that accompanied them, and the devout feeling so interfused as to overpower the sense of admiration which the learning, the love, the transcendent ability displayed in the composition were calculated to excite?" The keen David M'Nicoll came to this conclusion: "The truth seems to be, that God in his sovereignty accompanied the labors of this distinguished minister with an unusual effusion of the Holy Spirit; for no intellectual or even moral qualities of his discourses, admirable as they were, will fully solve the problem of his matchless popularity." The clear-headed James Dixon confessed that he "got more information from Clarke's Bible than from any other commentary;" and added, "He who could acquire twenty languages, so as to be able to use them all, and no doubt to expatiate on them with exquisite delight, could not be considered as a mean man. He was well acquainted with philosophy, logic, metaphysics, history, and politics. He moved over all nature. As to theology, of course that became his home. He was a deep thinker, a powerful reasoner. He was a giant, and there were few men his equals. When in preaching he had finished his argument, he used to come down upon us with tremendous force. He seemed to concentrate the truth he had been uttering into one focus. His declamation, in the latter part of his sermon, was overwhelming. I have seen a congregation, in one of our large chapels, literally subdued by the power and force of his declamation. Some were weeping, some smiling, and some shouting for joy—all commotion." The eloquent Joseph Beaumont wrote: "As a preacher, I consider Dr. Clarke to have been pre-eminently great, and that he occupied a field of religious eloquence altogether and exclusively his own. The whole kingdom has acknowledged the sway of his master mind as a teacher of the people. The truths of revelation received a coloring, and flew forth from his skillful hands with an energy that secured the attention, admiration, and reverence of myriads, and the actual reception and personal belief of thousands. His manner of preaching was, beyond all comparison, authoritative and force-

ful; and no one could listen to him without being assured that he was as certain of the truth that he was enforcing, as of his own existence. He spoke in the fullness of his heart, and delivered, with the earnestness of a messenger of God, that which he had received from the Lord Jesus Christ."

The testimony of the sagacious James Everett is: "Clarke was well versed in many languages, and was well acquainted with ancient history, sacred and profane, and chiefly that of oriental nations, with the geography of the several countries of the East, the Fathers, ecclesiastical writers, chronologists, the rabbins, ancient commentators, with the physical sciences, and had such skill in criticism as to lead him through the labyrinths of the various readings of the sacred text. In the pulpit the whole was loose, free, easy, and yet not careless: all being poured forth like one unbroken stream, with here and there a powerful rush, setting all around on the move; deep, yet simple as the element itself, clear and refreshing, and without any apparent effort."

The following comparison, from the pen of the classical Jonathan Crowther, the intimate friend of Richard Watson, will interest the reader: "Watson in science was a mere child by the side of Adam Clarke; nor had he, when compared with the latter, much more than passed his boyhood of general reading. Clarke, on the other hand, was immensely his inferior for *occasional* magnificence, and for real elegance. There was another advantage which Watson had, so far as the remark concerns himself; his mighty powers generally threw the defect of his early education into the shade, which was in a great measure compensated by close application in after life; while Clarke invariably maintained on all disputed points the character and dignity of the scholar."

Wesley, that accurate judge of character, not long after Clarke entered on the ministry, wrote; "Adam Clarke is doubtless an extraordinary young man, and capable of doing much good;" and in his will appointed him one of the seven trustees of all his literary property. After he had finished the labors of fifty years, the following is the opinion of the highest authority in Methodism, the ministers assembled in Conference. They say in their obituary of him: "As a man, a preacher, or a writer, we may safely place him in all these

characters, among the great men of his age. He was highly distinguished by his extraordinary attainments in Oriental literature, which appears to have been one of the most favorite studies of his life, and by means of which he has often shed a new and profitable light upon the sacred text. Of his writings in general it may be confidently said, they have added largely to the valuable literary and biblical stores of the country. The ability and fervent zeal with which for so many years he preached the Gospel of the grace of God to enraptured thousands, in almost every part of the United Kingdom, will long be remembered with the liveliest gratitude to their divine Redeemer, by multitudes to whom his labors were greatly blessed, both as to the means of their conversion, and of their general edification. No man, in any age of the Church, was ever known for so long a period to have attracted larger audiences; no herald of salvation ever sounded forth his message with greater faithfulness or fervor—the fervor of love to Christ, and to the souls of perishing sinners; and few ministers of the Gospel in modern times have been more honored by the extraordinary unction of the Holy Spirit in their ministrations. To this unction chiefly, though associated with uncommon talents, must be attributed the wonderful success and popularity of his discourses."

He had also a happy method of conducting the seeking soul directly to the Saviour. Honest William Dawson characteristically remarked: "Image to yourself Adam Clarke and Joseph Benson in the same pulpit; Jesus Christ in one corner of the chapel and a penitent in another; the former presses the penitent to go direct across the chapel and through the crowd to Christ. 'No, Brother Clarke,' says Benson, 'that wont do; he must not disturb the people in the center. Let him go *round* the skirts of the congregation, and by taking the extremity of the chapel he will be able to come at the Saviour in that way, without inconvenience to others.' Adam's is the *shorter cut;* he concludes that the penitent cannot reach Christ *too soon*, and that others ought to forego any little inconvenience, either by simply rising or by stepping aside. He has the sinner brought to Christ before Benson has got well through his definitions."

10. *Successful.* And here we must not pass over his intimate

and unbroken intercourse with God. This was doubtless the secret of his effectiveness in winning souls. His was a life of uniform, practical, growing piety. Religion was all his enjoyment, his hope, his trust. His peace flowed as a river, his righteousness as the waves of the sea. His fellowship was with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. When reference was made to the academical honors he received, but which he never sought, he observed to a friend, "Learning I love; learned men I prize; with the company of the great and good I am often much delighted; but infinitely above all these and all other possible enjoyments, I glory in Christ, in me living and reigning, and fitting me for his heaven." The venerable Henry Moore, who knew Clarke before his entrance into the ministry, and who lived to preach his funeral sermon, bore this testimony: "Our Connection never knew a more blameless life than that of Dr. Clarke. His opponents never dared to fix a stain either upon his moral or religious character. He was, as Mr. Wesley used to say, what a preacher of the gospel should be, without stain; or as a greater than he had said, 'Which of you convinceth me of sin?' His deep piety enabled him to pursue a straight course of honest uprightness; to say with the patriarch, "Till I die, I will not remove my integrity from me; my righteousness I hold fast and will not let it go; my heart shall not reproach me as long as I live." Nothing could warp him from his purpose. No hardships could subdue, no persecutions intimidate, no threatenings overawe him. He was often in perils by sea and by land. At Guernsey he was surrounded, while preaching, by a desperate mob with drums, horns, and various offensive weapons, throwing stones and dirt. In Jersey a furious gang resolved to pull down the house in which he was preaching. One of them presented a pistol at him through the window opposite to the pulpit, which twice flashed in the pan. He went out amid a volley of stones, passed through hundreds armed with spades, forks, and bludgeons, who were so overawed by the power of God that he escaped unhurt. At another time one of the magistrates, with the drummer of a regiment, pulled him down while at prayer, and delivered him into the hands of the mob. The drummer attended him out of the town, beating the "Rogue's March" on his drum, and beating the preacher fre-

quently with the drum-sticks. Such were the dangers he nobly braved in the early period of his ministry. Late in life he wrote to a young preacher: "I well know what you must suffer through the want of the necessaries of life, and particularly through innutritive food, and bad or no beds. I have suffered in this way often. You cannot conceive how destitute we were in many cases, about half a century ago, when I came into the Methodist Connection. Bad beds and damp beds were common, and innutritive food common. I have often lodged in out-houses in the coldest weather, without fire, and with scarcely enough of clothes to keep the vital spark in existence." And yet, when worn down by excessive labors and privations, this was his heroic language: "I have sometimes preached when scarcely able to stand. But still it is not the burden of the Lord to me. I know it to be my duty; I feel it my privilege; and this, through mercy, renders it my pleasure. I seem to have little to mind, but the one thing needful, that I may save my own soul and those who hear me. There is scarcely a time I preach but I feel the foundations of my feeble nature shaken; yet it affords me no uneasy reflection. My soul says, and glory be to God can sing too:

> Happy, if with my latest breath
> I may but gasp his name;
> Preach him to all, and cry in death,
> Behold, behold the Lamb.

I have a blessed persuasion, after the tapering thread of life is spun out, I shall see God for myself. I *cannot*, I *will not* doubt it. But I should if the JESUS on whose merits I have ventured my poor soul was not INFINITE LOVE. Yes, such a Saviour becomes *me*."

We marvel not that a minister to whom God had thus given not the spirit of fear, but of power, of love, and of a sound mind, should be extensively useful. When in Liverpool Clarke wrote: "Such times of refreshing from His presence I never saw. Should I die to-morrow, I shall praise God to all eternity that I have lived to the present time. The labor is severe; nine or ten times a week we have to preach. But God carries on his own work, and this is enough. My soul lies at his feet. He has graciously renewed and enlarged my commission. All is happiness and prosperity. We have a

most blessed work; numbers are added, and multitudes are built up in our most holy faith." From Manchester he wrote: "This morning at Oldham-street the congregation was really awful. I had the kingdom of God opened to me, and the glory of the Lord filled the whole place. Toward the conclusion the cries were great. It was with difficulty I could get the people to leave the chapel." From Bristol: "I am this instant returned from King-street. The chapel crowded —crowded! and God in a most especial manner enabled me to deliver such a testimony, from 1 Thess. i, 3, as, I think, I never before delivered. I did feel as in the eternal world, having all things beneath me, with such expansion of mind as the power of God alone could give." And again: "I would not have missed coming to this place for five hundred pounds. I got my own soul blessed, and God blessed the people. I felt that I was drawing the whole congregation to me closer and closer, and pulling them away from the world to God." When in London he remarked: "Such an outpouring of the Spirit of God I never saw before. Every part of the city seemed to partake of it." On another occasion he wrote: "We have many who have been brought into the liberty of the Gospel; and the great work of salvation is deepening in the souls of believers. We preach Christ crucified, and his power and willingness to save *from all sin;* and God adds his testimony to the heart. I have long seen that we do very little in preaching the Gospel, if we leave the *root of sin* untouched. We may lop off a thousand branches, and yet have a thousand branches to lop off; for unless the root be destroyed, in vain do we look for Christian life and Christian temples." And in a sermon before the Conference in Liverpool in 1832, a few weeks before his death, having remarked that when a boy he obtained the faith of assurance, he burst forth in the most impassioned strain: "Yes, glory be to God! I *had* got it; and what is more, *I still have it.*"

It is pleasant to dwell on such rare excellences, but we must stop. Enough has been written to show that Adam Clarke, as a minister, moved in an orbit peculiarly his own, and that while on earth he was a burning and a shining light; and having turned many to righteousness, he now shines in a purer and serener region as a star of the first magnitude and splendor.

Art. IV.—REPROBATION.

I. Definition of Reprobation.

1. *Supralapsarian.* Reprobatio peremptoria est decretum Dei, quo pro voluntate sua liberrima, ad declarationem justitiæ suæ vindicantis, certos ex humano universo genere homines nec gratia nec gloria donare, sed in peccatum libere prolabi permittere et in peccatis relinquere, justèque tandem propter peccata condemnare constituit.—Gomarus: *De Rep., Thesis* 2.

2. *Sublapsarian.* Reprobatio est decretum Dei, quo ex mero voluntatis suæ beneplacito certos homines, quos non elegit, in massa corruptionis relinquere, et peccata peccatis cumulantes, atque justo judicio suo induratos, ad manifestationem gloriæ justitiæ suæ, æternis pœnis afficere statuit.—Heidegger: *Corpus Theol.*, lib. v, 54.

II. Proof that God has formed such a Decree.

The proof that there exists such a divine decree is sought partly in the following passages of Scripture: Jer. vi, 30; Matt. vii, 23; John xvii, 9; Rom. ix, 22; 1 Peter ii, 7, 8; Jude 4; Rev. xiii, 8; xvii, 8; xx, 5; partly in arguments like the following: (1) Si non omnes sunt electi ad vitam æternam tum ceteri sunt reprobati; et prius est, ergo et posterius.* (2) Quoscunque Christus a se repellet in judicio ultimo, ii profecto sunt ab æterno a Deo reprobati. Propositio hæc certa est, quia qui sunt electi, eos Christus a se non repellet (Ioh. vi, 37.) At multos Christus a se repellet in judicio ultimo. (Matt. vii, 23; viii, 12; xxv, 41.) (3) Si non omnes sunt oves, sed multi hirci seu hœdi qui abituri sunt ad supplicium æternum, tum sunt a Deo reprobati. At illud est, ut docet caput xxv Mti. Sic dicit Christus ad Judæos, Ioh. x, 26. (4) Si sunt aliqui, pro quibus Christus non oravit, pro quibus non est mortuus efficaciter, qui sunt ex mundo; tum reprobati sunt a Deo. At primum est, ut Christus testatur, (Ioh. xvii,) ergo et

* "Multi, ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, electionem ita fatentur, ut negent quemquam reprobari, sed inscite nimis et pueriliter, quando ipsa electio nisi reprobatione opposita non staret. Quos præterit, reprobat, vult excludere." —Calvin: *Institutio Christ. Relig.*, 1585, l. iii, c. xxiii, 7.

extremum. (5) Si sunt aliqui reprobati, tum reprobatio est. Illud est, ergo et hoc. Assumptum probant exempla Caiini Chami, Ismælis, Esavi, Judæ Iscariotæ.—POLANUS: *Syntagma Theol. Christ.*, iv, 10.

III. WHY GOD HAS REPROBATED THE REPROBATE.

Esau, nullo adhuc scelere inquinatus, odio habetur. Predestinationis enim fundamentum non est in operibus. Apostolus non dicit, Deum rependisse Esau secundum suam malitiam, sed diversa solutione contentus est, quod in hunc finem excitentur reprobi, ut Dei gloria per illos illustraretur. Deinde dicet, Deum cujus vult miserere et quem vult indurare. Vides, ut in solum Dei arbitrium utrumque conferat? Rationem nullam habemus, nisi quoniam ita illi placet.—CALVIN: *Inst.*, b. iii, c. xxii, 11.

Causa reprobationis nec fuit prævisa infidelitas, nec prævisa peccata, nec odium Dei adversus reprobos, sed sola Dei *ἐυδοκία*. —SCHARPIUS: *Cursus Theol.*, Genev., 1620, p. 309.

Ut prævisa sanctorum fides ac opera bona causa non fuerunt electionis eorum, sic prævisa impiorum infidelitas, aut alia peccata minimè fuerunt causa cur a Deo fuerunt reprobati, sed sicut illos elegit in Christo secundum propositum voluntatis suæ, sic hos reprobavit secundum idem propositum voluntatis suæ.—ZANCHIUS: *De Nat. Dei.*, p. 711.

Efficiens causa reprobationis principalis est Deus, impellens beneplacitum Dei.—ALSTED: *Theol. Schol.*, Hanov., 1618, p. 214.

Si decreti reprobationis causa efficiens esset peccatum, tum æternum Dei decretum ab hominibus penderet.—POLANUS: *Syntag. Theol.*, p. 1616.

Reprobationis finis duplex est, (1) principalis nempe Dei gloria; demonstratæ gloriæ duobis modis inservit reprobatio, ad demonstrandum Dei potentiam et summum jus faciendi de creaturis quod vult, ad commendandam Dei misericordiam erga electos; (2) salus electorum.—SCHARPIUS: *Ibid.*, p. 309.

Ut Christus causa est, non electionis, sed salutis, ita infidelitas causa est, non reprobationis, sed damnationis.—WOLLEBIUS: *Christ. Theol. Compendium*, Basil, 1626, p. 23.

Reprobatio non minus ac electio vel absolute consideratur respectu unius, vel comparate et relate, respectu plurium.

Priori sensu quæri potest, quare Deus hunc vel illum reprobarit? et respondetur: quia, propter peccatum dignus fuit, qui reprobaretur; non quod peccatum proprie sit causa reprobationis, alias omnes reprobati fuissent, qui erant pariter peccatores: sed, quia est conditio et qualitas in objecto præcedanea, ex qua oritur in homine reprobabilitas. *Posteriori* sensu quæri potest: cur hunc potius quam illum reprobarit, cum ambo essent ex æquo peccatores, ideoque reprobabiles? hic peccatum allegare non potest, quia est commune utrique, et causa nulla reddi potest præter solum Dei beneplacitum, quia ita illi libuit.—RIISSEN: *Turretini Compend. Theol., auctum et illustratum*, Amstel., 1695, l. vi, c. 17.

Finis reprebationis *summus* est Dei reprobantis gloria, tum iræ tum justitiæ, tum potentiæ tum liberrimæ potestatis; *subalternus* respectu electorum, ut ex severitate in alios benignitatem Dei erga se rectius agnoscant, respectu reproborum justa ipsorum damnatio propter peccata.—ALTINGIUS: *Opera Omnia*, Amstel., 1687. *Meth. Theol. didact.*, 39.

Causam cur Deus decrevit quosdam homines ita eligere, alios non, esse purum putum beneplacitum ipsius et meram gratiam non autem quod præviderit alium quidem crediturum in Christum, alium v. non.—*Contraremonst. Coll. Hag.*, p. 58.

Dicere, Deum quosdam reprobasse propter prævisam incredulitatem, blasphemum est in Deum cui hac ratione jus suum detrahitur, gloria eripitur.—PARÆUS, *in Rom.*, c. ix, v. 13, p. 841.

Finis *summus* reprobationis est gloria Dei, ut apostolus dicit, Deum comparasse vasa iræ ad interitum ut notam faceret mundo et iram et potentiam. . . . Finis *subalternus* est salus electorum, nam Deus ideo reprobavit plurimos, ut sic publicaret divitias gloriæ suæ erga vasa misericordiæ. Ideo tam multos reprobavit, ut in electis excitaret reverentiam potentiæ suæ, et declararet magnitudinem gratiæ suæ erga electos, eo quod et eos non reprobaverit, cum tamen potuerit. . . . Finis *accidentarius* est exitium reproborum, non per se, quatenus est exitium et malum quid, sed per accidens, quatenus est medium serviens illustrandæ gloriæ Dei et adjuvandæ saluti electorum.—ALSTEDT, *ibid.*, p. 219.

IV. What Reprobation Includes.

Reprobation includes two *actus voluntatis divinæ.* These are, according to the Supralapsarian scheme, (1) *præordinatio peccati*, and (2) *prædamnatio peccatorum;* according to the Sublapsarian view, (1) *præteritio, id est, indebitæ gratiæ negatio*, and (2) *prædamnatio*, that is, *debitæ pœnæ destinatio.*

1. *Supralapsarian Doctrine.*—Duplex est reprobationis actus. *Prior* est propositum deserendi quosdam homines, justitiamque in eis declarandi. Hujus actus causa finalis dari potest, impulsiva extra Deum dari non potest. Oritur enim ex mero Dei beneplacito, nullo habito respectu vel boni vel mali in creatura. Nam voluntas Dei est causa causarum. Ibi ergo consistendum est, et extra vel ultra illam ratio non quærenda: imo ultra nihil est. Deinde omnis homo (assertore Paulo) est ad Deum ut massa luti in manu figuli; et proinde Deus pro summo jure suo vasa ad iram facit, non invenit. Non autem faciet, sed a ipsis facta inveniet, se in æterno consilio suo dicamus eum homines qua peccatores tantum, non qua homines præterire justissimis, licet nobis ignotis, rationibus voluisse. *Secundus* actus est ordinatio ad pœnam sive justum exitium. Ordinatio ista pro vario cogitandi modo distingui potest in simplicem et comparatam. Ordinatio simplex est qua iste, puta Petrus vel Iohannes, ordinatur ad pœnam. Estque ordinatio ista a justissima Dei voluntate, non tamen excluso respectu originalis vel actualium peccatorum. Ut enim actu damnantur homines ob peccatum, ita decrevit Deus eosdem damnare ob idem peccatum. Non est tamen peccatum decreti reprobationis causa, sed in præscientia divina ordinis ratione antecedit, non quidem priorem illum, sed hunc posteriorem actum. Ordinatio comparata est qua unus non alius, et in pari conditione iste magis quam ille ad pœnam ordinatur. Istius reprobationis comparatæ causa est mera Dei voluntas, etiam absque respectu illius peccati.—Perkins: *De Prædest. et Gratia Dei.*

Qui vult finem, is necessario etiam vult media, quæ ad finem consequendum necessaria sunt. Ad patefactionem autem misericordiæ et justitiæ in peccato condonando et puniendo necessariam est peccatum.—Piscatorius, *in Resp. ad Apol. Bertii.*, p. 130.

Deus ideo homini mandatum dedit, ut illud transgrederetur homo, atque ipse hoc modo occasionem nancisceretur puniendi ipsum.—*Ibid.*, p. 50.

Fatemur factum fuisse Dei consilio ac voluntate, ut Adamus lapsus est, et ut nos omnes in hanc conditionis miseriam, qua nunc sumus irretiti, decideremus.—CALVIN: Inst., lib. iii, c. xxi, 7.

Ad peccatum tamen, ut peccatum, quatenus ex eo gloria Dei bonitate ipsius Dei illustranda erat, tam electi quam reprobi fuerunt præordinati.—ZANCHIUS, *de Nat. Dei*, p. 722.

Deus hoc concilio condidit hominem, ut reipsa laberetur; quippe cum non nisi hac ratione pervenire potuerit ad fines illos principales.—PISCATORIUS, *contra Schafm.*, p. 29.

Deus etiam ipsum primi hominis lapsum ordinavit et fieri decrevit, et quidem ab æterno, quemadmodum et ipsam hominis creationem ab æterno decrevit.—DANÆUS, *in Isagog.*, p. 144.

Quanquam in peccato Adami illud factum est, quod ex decreto Dei fore constitutum erat, tamen ipsum decretum Dei non fuit Adamo cognitum, nempe Deum velle ut ipse peccaret.—DANÆUS, *Ibid.*, p. 149.

Falsum est, Deum non habere opus peccatore; opus eo habet ad patefaciendam gloriam suam. Impossibile est, ut Deus alia via ad finem sibi propositum perveniret.—PISCATORIUS: *Resp. ad Apol. Bertii*, p. 44.

Si Deus operatus est impium ad pœnam sequitur quod eundem etiam operatus sit ad peccatum; qui nisi peccatum præcessisset, pœnam ei juste infligere non posset.—PISCATORIUS, *contra Hemming de Gratia Dei*, p. 76.

2. *Infralapsarian Doctrine.*—Primò distinguendus venit ante omnia *duplex* reprobationis *actus;* licet enim a parte Dei unico et simplicissimo actu peragatur, solet tamen juxta nostrum concipiendi modum inadæquatum ad faciliorem rei intelligentiam in duos dispesci a theologis, quorum prior *negativus* dicitur, posterior verò affirmativus seu *positivus*. Ille refertur ad *præteritionem*, iste ad *prædamnationem*. . . . Actus *negativus* duo includit, tum *præteritionem*, per quam in aliorum electione, tum ad gloriam, tum ad gratiam, illos neglexit et insuper habuit, quod patet ex eventu electionis; tum *desertionem negativam*, qua ipsos in massa corrupta et sua

miseria reliquit. . . . Actus *positivus*. . . . qui dicitur *prædamnatio*, duo includit, destinationem ad damnationem, per quam sunt vasa iræ coagmentata ad interitum, tum destinatio ad judicia intermedia, inter quæ præcipium est excæcatio et induratio, quæ solis *ἀπολλυμένοις* contingit.—F. TURRETIN: *Inst. Theol.*, pp. 419, 420.

Reprobationis docendi causa duo actus statuuntur: indebitæ gratiæ negatio, quæ *præteritio*, et debitæ pœnæ destinatio, quæ *prædamnatio* dicitur.—WOLLEBIUS, *ibid.*, 23.

Reprobationis universæ natura absolvitur his partibus, quod Deus tum ut *αὐτοκράτωρ*, absolutus dominus, puro puto arbitrio suo disponens de iis, qui ab hac dispositione reprobi dicuntur; tum ut justus judex, nemini nisi peccatori damnationem decernens, ad illustrandam gloriam justitiæ suæ certos homines in communi peccatorum massa jacentes, adeoque nec ceteris deteriores, partim præteriit, partim ad exitium destinavit, partim eodem decreto fini huic convenientia media subordinavit. Præteriit autem in præparatione tum gloriæ, tum gratiæ. In præparatione gloriæ, quatenus regnum cœlorum solis a patre benedictis præparavit. (Matt. xxv, 34, 41.) In præparatione gratiæ, quatenus illos non dedit filio redimendos æque ac electos. (Ioh. xvii, 9; Matt. xiii, 11; xi, 26.) —HEIDEGGER: *Corpus Theol.*, v, p. 56.

Reprobatio est decretum Dei de relinquendis certis hominibus in peccato et propter peccatum damnandis. Duplicem in se actum includit; *prior* actus est propositum Dei deserendi quosdam et sibi relinquendi; hic actus est absolutus, pendens a solo et absoluto Dei arbitrio. *Alter* actus est propositum damnandi propter peccata; his actus non est absolutus, sed continet respectum et conditionem peccati.—KECKERMANN: *Systema Sanct. Theol.*, p. 172.

V. MEANS BY WHICH GOD EXECUTES THIS DECREE.

The foreordained *media fini huic convenientia*, mentioned in the last extract but one, are as follows: desertio reprobatorum, separatio eorumdem a Christo et gratia redemptionis sive reconciliationis, omissio vocationis vel saltem vocatio inefficax, retentio peccatorum, excæcatio, sive induratio et finalis impœnitentia.—HEIDEGGER, v. 65.

Quæ sunt executionis decreti Dei peculiaria de reprobandis hominibus media? Numero itidem sena. (1) Peccatorum actualium infinita soboles. (2) Ἀπιστία, infidelitas sive alienatio et separatio a Christo. (3) Desertio, sive nulla aut inefficax per verbi prædicationem vocatio, aut ad vocationem interna responsio. . . . (4) Pertinacia, sive induratio et excæcatio in peccatis. (5) Hinc est perpetua Dei aversatio, contemptus et progressio ex peccato in peccatum. (6) Tandem justissima eorum condemnatio inde sequitur.—BUCANUS: *Instit. Theol.*, Gen., 1609, l. xxxvi, 39.

Qui vult alicui serio finem, is etiam vult et confert, quantum in se est, media ad eum obtinendum necessaria, maxime si ea omnia in manu sua habet, et si ab eo solo pendent.—TURRETIN, I, p. 40.

Media hujus reprobationis exequendæ esse, aut potius ex tali æterna reprobatione sequi, quod Deus impiis, quando in hoc mundo nascuntur, gratiam suam, vocemque et doctrinam Evangelii omnino et in totum, aut saltem internam cordium illuminationem et gratiam eam, per quam vocationi evangelicæ respondere valent, negat, eosque in naturali sua cœcatate et duritie relinquit: imo, quod Sathanæ ipsis operanti traduntur et in prædam dantur.—ZEPPERUS: *Instit. de Prædest.*, p. 18.

Reprobationem consequuntur denegatio gratiæ, hanc peccata, peccata pœnæ peccatorum, ad quæ omnia præordinavit Deus reprobos ab omni æternitate.—ZANCHIUS: *Nat. Dei*, p. 620.

Fuit ergo hoc primum, quod de Reprobis constituit Deus ab æterno, nempe quorundam hominum ad exitium sempiternum destinatio. Ad hoc autem ordinata fuerunt ipsorum peccata, et ad peccata desertio gratiæque denegatio.—ZANCHIUS, *ibid.*, p. 740.

Reprobationem tria consequuntur: privatio gratiæ, peccata, et pœnæ peccatorum.—GOMARUS: *Disput. de Prædest.*

Deum non tantum ad damnationem sed etiam ad causas damnationis predestinasse quoscunque libuit, verum esse agnoscimus.—BEZA: *De Natura Dei*, p. 417.

Damus reprobos necessitate peccandi, eoque et pereundi ex hac Dei ordinatione constringi, atque ita constringi, ut nequeant non peccare atque perire.—ZANCHIUS, *ibid.*, p. 744.

VI. What Proportion of the Human Race were Reprobated.

In *paucitate* credentium apparet diversitas; non communis omnium est electio. Mundus ad suum creatorem non pertinet, nisi quod a maledictione, ira Dei et morte æterna *non multos* eripit gratia, *mundum* vero in suo interitu relinquit.—Calvin: *Inst.*, III., xxii, 7.

Si *pauci* tantum sunt electi, tum reliqui sunt reprobati.—Scharpius, p. 303.

Misericordia non universalis—sed ex perditis salvare *aliquos* ex omni gente.—Wendelinus: *Systema*, p. 184.

Deus reprobavit *plurimos*, ut sic publicaret divitias gloriæ suæ erga vasa misericordiæ.—Alstedt, p. 219.

Infidelitas est consequens reprobationis.—Turretin, I., p. 425. Ex multis *vix paucos* credere.—*Consensus Genevensis*, p. 254.

Quisque mandato Dei tenetur credere se inter *paucos* hos [electos] esse.—Gomarus, *de Prædest.*, thesi 8.

Scriptura aperte docet, non omnes, sed *aliquos* tantum esse electos.—Alting: *Syllab. Controv.*, p. 159.

Electio ex ista miseria ad salutem *particularis*, et *plurimorum* præteritio immota, quos Deus in sua miseria, liberrimo sed justissimo tamen judicio, qui voluit.—Turretin, tom. I, p. 439.

Illos non vult salvari Deus, quos ne quidem verbo suo vult vocare ad fidem et salutem. Nam cui denegantur media, illis etiam denegari censetur finis. At *innumeris* denegavit verbi præconium, quod solum est medium ad fidem et salutem, ut sub V. T. omnibus gentibus, sub N. vero variis adhuc populis, quibus nunquam affulsit lux evangelii, et qui in tenebris densissimis paganismi adhuc jacent.—Turretin, I, 443.

Dilectio de qua agitur, (Io. iii, 16,) quum Deus dicitur, ita dilexisse mundum etc. non potest esse universalis erga omnes et singulos, sed *specialis* erga *paucos*.—Turretin, I, 446.

Ast jam, proh dolor! intelligo, *longe maximam* miserorum hominum *partem* indignam misericordia gratiaque futuram, *paucissimosque* gratiæ meæ nullum obicem obdituros.—Steph. Vitus: *Defensio Apologiæ Synodi Dordr. et Reform. Fidei*, Cassellis, 1726, p. 230.

VII. Reprobate Infants.

Multi sunt piorum infantes, ante ullum rationis usum morientes, multæque sunt hominum adultorum myriades . . . et quamvis nullus accesserit evangelii contemptus, tamen originalis illa peccati labes hominibus damnandis suffecerit.—Perkins, *Armill.*, p. 281.

In reprobis infantibus executio decreti Dei sic est: ubi primum nati sunt, ob primarii et nativi peccati reatum sibi relicti morientes, reprobantur in æternum.—Perkins, *ibid.*, p. 219.

Infantum qui in Christo moriuntur, antequam operari aliquid potuerunt, diversa est ratio. Hi enim simpliciter aut servabuntur secundum gratiam, aut damnabuntur secundum naturam filii iræ etc.—Paræus, *in Rom.* p. 232.

Infantes morientes quomodo serventur et damnentur.—Paræus, *ibid.*, Index.

Unde factum est, ut tot gentes una cum liberis eorum infantibus æternæ morti involverit lapsus Adæ absque remedio.—Calvin, III, xxiii.

Quod proinde juste agat Deus quicquid agit, etiam indurando et condemnando infantes, si modo hoc ipsi voluntate arcana placeat.—Rippertus Sixt., *Necess.*, p. 804.

De parvulis autem *Christianorum*, qui absque sacramento decedunt, si interrogarer, responderem, de illis spem bonam habendam esse.—Martyr: *Loc. Com.*, p. 137.

Nec Zwinglius, nec Calvinus, nec quisquam nostrûm indefinite omnes infantes sine baptismo vel in utero matris, vel in partu, vel dum ad baptismum gestantur decedentes, in cœlo cum beatis collocant; sed de solis infantibus Ecclesiæ in fœdere natis, si morte præveniantur canone charitatis ita pronunciant, ex singulari privilegio promissionis parentibus et liberis factæ in fœdere: Ero Deus tuus et seminis tui, salva tamen electione Dei, quæ ut olim in Abrahami et Isaaci, ita deinceps in fidelium liberis sæpe discrimen fecit ac facit, nec scrutandum nec sugillandum, sed adorandum. Rom. ix, 11. Hæc est nostra et doctorum nostrorum constans de hac questione sententia.—Paræus, *de Amissione Gratiæ et Statu Peccati, contra Bellarminum*, lib. vi, p. 891.

Si decreti reprobationis causa esset peccatum, tum aut orig-

inale aut actuale. At non originale, quia tum omnes homines naturaliter nascentes reprobati fuissent, cum omnes peccato originali sunt infecti. Nec actuale, quia sic nulli infantes vel Judæorum et Turcarum, vel in utero matris, vel paulo post nativitatem mortui, a Deo reprobati essent. Ergo, etc.—SCHARPIUS: *Curs. Theol. Controv.*, I.

VIII. WHY GOD CREATED REPROBATES.

Creatio reproborum est fructus reprobationis.—FESTUS HOMMIUS: *Notæ ad Catech.*, p. 216.

Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes, sed aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur.—CALVIN, III, xxi, 5.

Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent, et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit.—CALVIN, III, xxiv, 12.

Quosdam homines a Deo opifice conditos esse ad interitum.—BEZA, *ad Rom.* ix, 22.

Deus constituit condere homines ad diversos fines; nempe alios ad fruendum salute æterna, alios vero ad sentiendum cruciatos æternos, seu ad exitium æternum.—MACCOVIUS, *de Præd.*, thesi viii.

Impios fuisse destinatò creatos ut perirent.—CALVIN: *Com. Rom.*, ix, 18.

Alios esse a Deo creatos ut perirent, videtur prima fronte absurdum, Scriptura tamen id dicit.—MARTYR: *Loci Com.*, p. 994.

Quos Deus prædestinavit ad exitium sempiternum, eos etiam creat ad exitium sempiternum; eiis sunt ad exitium sempiternum omnia illa, quæ electis ad salutem.—POLANUS, *in Oseam*, c. xiii, 9.

IX. WHY GOD VOUCHSAFES TO REPROBATES AN EXTERNAL VOCATION AND THE USE OF THE MEANS OF GRACE.

Ecce vocem ad eos [reprobos] dirigit, sed ut magis obsurdescant; lucem accendit, sed ut reddantur cæciores; doctrinam profert, sed qua magis obstupescant; remedium adhibet sed ne sanentur.—CALVIN: *Instit.*, III, xxiv, 13.

Neque hoc quoque controverti potest, quos Deus illuminatos non vult, illis doctrinam suam ænigmatibus involutam tradere, ne quid inde proficiant, nisi ut in majorem hebetudinem tradantur.—*Ibidem.*

Quandoquidem isti [reprobi] antequam Christus ipsis prædicetur, in peccatis mortui et damnationi per legis transgressionem obnoxii erant, necesse est sequatur Christum ipsis prædicari ad damnationis ipsorum aggravationem. Et hæc quidem est intentio Dei, quando reprobis Christum curat annunciari. —Donteclockius, *Contra Anonym.*, c. iii.

Electos solos a Deo trahi ad fidem per potentiam omnipotentem, cui ipsi resistere non possunt: Reprobos vero contra, etiamsi templum frequentent, verbum Dei audiant, utantur sacramentis, etc., per hæc tamen illuminari non posse; sed omnia hæc media ipsis cedere aggravandæ ipsorum condemnationi, quia scilicet Deus voluit gloriam suam per ipsorum exitium declarare.—Revius: *Acta Synodolia Dordr. Rem.*, A. 38.

Denique reprobis ommia co-operantur in malum, ipsorum reproborum vitia, etiam bona, nempe gratia Dei, et dona Spiritus Sancti.—Zanchius: *De Nat. Dei*, p. 644.

Eos [reprobos] ut in finem suam perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus prædicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit.—Calvin, III, xxiv, 12, 24.

X. Justice and Propriety of Unconditional Reprobation.

Quare si quos destinavit ac creavit ad exitium, injustitiæ accusari non potest, duplici, nomine et jure. Primum absoluto dominii, deinde subordinato et relato (quod peccata spectat) judicii.—Gomarus: *Disp. de Præd.*, thesi 27.

At cùm Deus hominem ad peccatum necessitat, ut eum propter peccatum puniat, juste agit, quia habet potestatem hominem gubernandi ut vult.—Piscatorius: *Resp. ad Dupl. Vorstii*, p. 223.

Non modo igitur per illam *ὑπεροχήν* tantam, Deo licet creaturam insontem cruciatibus addicere ratione durationis infinitis, sed etiam immensis ratione magnitudinis atque atrocitatis, si creatura eorum capax est. Quando enim jus summum *ἐν ὑπεροχῇ* positum est, quanta est *ὑπεροχή*, tantum jus illud etiam

esse necesse est.—AMYRALDUS: *Dissert. Theol.*, quatuor. Dissert., II.

Licet Deus per istam desertionem neget homini illud sine quo vitari non potest peccatum, non propterea peccati causalitas illi tribui potest; (1) quia Deus jure illam negat, nec tenetur gratiam illam cuiquam dare;* (2) ex illa negatione non sequitur potentia peccandi, quam homo habet a seipso, sed tantum non curatio istius impotentiæ; (3) Deus negat gratiam quam nolunt ipsi accipere nec retinere, et quam ultro aspernantur, cum nihil minus cupiant, quam regi a Spiritu Sancto; (4) non negat illam gratiam ut peccent, sed ut ob peccatum luant.—TURRETIN, Tom. I, 420.

Etsi reprobi ad damnationem et ad causas damnationis sint destinati, et creati ut impiè vivant, et sint vasa plena fecibus peccatorum, non tamen inde sequitur, quod absolutum reprobationis decretum causa sit omnium scelerum et flagitiorum in mundo, quia præter scelera et flagitia reproborum in mundo etiam alia scelera et flagitia committuntur, nempe ab electis. —PISCATORIUS: *Contra Taufr.*, p. 47.

Dubitari nequit, quin Deus ab æterno quosdam reprobaverit. . . . Absque qua destinatione maxima hominum pars sine ullo Dei consilio ad finem suam decurreret, incertoque eventui permitteretur neque de exercenda justitia et judicio ab æterno quicquam Deus statuisset, quod de Deo, summo rerum omnium domino, et bonorum ac malorum clemente simul atque justo diribitore cogitari sine impietate non potest. —HEIDEGGER, *ibid.*, V. 55.

Millies satius est et æquius, ut omnes et singulæ creaturæ in cœlo ac in terra conferant ad revelandam in perditione sui æterna gloriam et majestatem Dei, quam ut inserviat necatio pulicis aut muscæ ad demonstrandam omnium in mundo hominum dignitatem.—PERKINS: *Symbol.*, p. 471.

XI. CONCLUSION.

Decretum quidem horribile fateor.—CALVIN: *Inst.*, III, xxiii.

* Dicimus ergo potestatem Dei in creaturis niti sola ὑπεροχῇ, excellentia et eminentia divinæ naturæ et dignitate. Ex qua fluit, ut Deus hominem reprobare, destinare ad mortem, gratiam efficacem denegare, alienum peccatum imputare et propter illud punire, denique ad impossibile obligare et affligere sine demerito possit. SZYDLOVIUS *in Vindiciis quæstionum aliquot difficilium et controversarum in Theologia.* Franek. cap. 12.

Art. V.—THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEA OF THE PASTORAL OFFICE.*

The New Testament Scriptures clearly teach that the true minister of the Gospel is called to his sacred office both by the Church and by the Holy Spirit. Various official titles are given him in the New Testament. He is called *Bishop*, (Επισκόπος, Phil i, 1; 1 Tim. iii, 2; Tit. i, 7; Acts xx, 28;) *Minister*, (Διακόνος, Υπηρέτης, Phil. i, 1; 1 Cor. iii, 5; 2 Cor. iii, 6; vi, 4; Acts xxvi, 16;) *Preacher*, (Κήρυξ, 1 Tim. ii, 7; 2 Tim. ii, 11;) *Teacher* (Διδάσκαλος, Ephes. iv, 11; 1 Tim. ii, 7;) *Evangelist*, (Ευαγγελίστης, Acts xxi, 8; Ephes. iv, 11; 2 Tim. iv, 5;) *Servant of Jesus Christ*, (Δοῦλος Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i, 1; Gal. i, 10; Phil. i, 1;) *Steward of the mysteries of God* (Οικονόμος μυστηρίων Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. iv, 1; Tit. i, 7;) *Messenger*, (Αγγελος, Rev. i, 20; ii, 1, 8, 12, 18;) *Pastor* or *Shepherd*, (Ποιμήν, John x, 11, 14, 16; Ephes. iv, 11.) The last title of *Pastor* or *Shepherd* is the most fitting, as well as the most beautiful of all: for it contains the fundamental idea of the pastoral office, the nature and design of which it is our purpose to investigate. On the one hand, it distinguishes the pastor from his flock, and invests him and his office with a certain dignity; on the other, it shows his connection with, and his duty toward, the flock, and his responsibility to the great Head of the Church. But both the *dignity* and the *duty* in the pastor are united by the tenderest and holiest bond—*love*. The true pastor does not assume the dignity of an autocrat, who looks upon his flock as his property, and does with it as he pleases; nor is his idea of duty that of a hireling or servant, who, because he is paid, mechanically performs it. He recognizes neither the hierarchical nor the ochlocratical tendency in the Church. It is contrary to the fundamental idea of his office to consider himself the sole hierarch or lord of faith; or for the Church to look upon him as a hireling, with whom she has entered into a contract that may at any time be dissolved. In John x, our Lord represents himself as the pattern and head of all good shepherds. In this chapter the three

* For some of the thoughts in the following pages we are indebted to an article in the German, by Prof. Plitt, of Bonn.

distinctive functions of the pastoral office are clearly discernible. 1. It is said in verse 3, that he *calls* the sheep, and that they *hear his voice.* This indicates, particularly, *the preaching of the word* by the pastor, and, generally, *the administration of his office* in relation to those who are to be brought to a saving knowledge of the truth, and become living members of the flock of Christ. The Apostle Paul alludes to the same idea when he says, (2 Cor. iv, 5, 6,) "For *we preach* not ourselves, but *Christ Jesus the Lord*, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." (See also 1 Cor. i, 5, 6; Col. i, 28; ii, 1, 2.) 2. Again it is said, in verse 3, that the good shepherd calleth his own sheep by name, and "*leadeth them out;*" and in verse 4th, that "*he goeth before them.*" This indicates *the government, guidance*, and *watchful care* of that portion of the great flock entrusted to him. "The going before them" refers more particularly *to his own holy example*, which both our Lord and the Apostle Paul make the fundamental condition of his office-work. (Acts xx, 28.) 3. Lastly, it is said in verse 11, "*The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.*" These words are not so much a prophecy as a declaration that of the pastor, in the accomplishment of his sublime mission, nothing less is required than a sacrifice of his time and talents, of his life, of his *all*—a complete dedication of himself to the pastoral office. This laying down his life for the sheep, this entire self-consecration to God and the Church, is the chief characteristic of a good shepherd. Our Lord himself exemplified it both by word and deed. (See John x; Matt. xx, 20; 1 John iii, 16.)

From what has been said, we perceive in what the work of the pastor consists. It consists in nothing less than in the establishment of a living union and communion between Christ and sinful man. This is to be effected, 1, *by preaching* or *teaching*, (διδάσκειν;) 2, by *governing* or *guiding*, (επισκοπεῖν;) 3, *by ministering* or *serving*, (διακονεῖν.) The elements of this union between Christ and the sinner are, 1, a knowledge of Christ; 2, following and obeying Christ; and 3, finding full satisfaction and enjoyment in Christ. Hence it is evident that a proper knowledge and apprehension of Christ is the root and foundation of the spiritual life of the soul—the basis of its union with Christ. "This is life eternal, that they might know

thee, the only true God, and *Jesus Christ*, whom thou hast sent." But how shall a sinner *know* Christ? By receiving instruction concerning him and his salvation. But how shall he be taught without a teacher? Hence we see that *teaching* or *preaching* is the first, if not the chief, business of the minister. This should not be lost sight of. Mere creeds and confessions, however orthodox—mere rituals and ceremonies, however elevating in their tone—should never be substituted for the preaching of the word. They are, *per se*, insufficient to establish a personal and vital union between Christ and his Church. Our Lord is very explicit on this point, when he says, (John xvii, 8,) "For I have given unto them THE WORDS [not the creeds, confessions, rituals, etc.,] which thou gavest me; and *they have received them*, and *have known surely* that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." Again he says, in verse 20, "Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also who shall believe on me *through their words*," that is, through their *preaching*. THE WORD OF GOD, then, is what the minister should preach; and he should preach it in the spirit of Christ and his apostles.

I. Since *preaching* or *teaching* is the first and most important duty of the minister, (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20,) let us examine the nature of preaching a little more closely. In so doing, we shall follow the suggestions of the Apostle Paul, (Tit. ii, 7,) "In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine showing *uncorruptness*, (*ἀδιαφθορίαν*,) *gravity*, (*σεμνότητα*,) *sincerity*, (*αφθαρσίαν*.)" The first requirement, then, in preaching, on the part of the minister, is *uncorruptness of doctrine*. This is not exactly synonymous with orthodoxy; it signifies something more profoundly *subjective*. It means more particularly the internal and external attitude he assumes in reference to the doctrines of the Bible, that is, the *mode* of his *internal* apprehension and *external* presentation of the divine truth. In presenting to the people the doctrines of Christianity, he must demonstrate to them the soundness of his mind, the incorruptibility, impartiality, and clearness of his motives, by avoiding all non-essential side-issues, prejudices, and conceits, and by treating sacred things in a sacred manner. Hence we perceive that this is not so much a *dogmatical* as an

ethical precept. Thus, it may easily happen that one minister shall be dogmatically correct, and at the same time far from being ἀδιαφθορος in doctrine; and another may unconsciously entertain partially erroneous views, but nevertheless be a faithful, honest, pure-minded minister of the word.

Next comes the σεμνοτης, the *gravity* or *dignity* of treatment. This has reference to the external manner of presenting the divine truth. But this dignity is not to be studied as a role. No artificial rules for the regulation of the σεμνοτης should be laid down; for they may easily lead one to acquire unnatural habits. The only rule that can be given, is for the minister thoroughly to enter into, and live in the spirit of, the sacred truths about to be delivered; for then only will the internal impression of the divine truth find a corresponding expression of manner, voice, attitude, etc.

Lastly comes the αφθαρσια, *sincerity*, which is no less an indispensable element of preaching than "uncorruptedness and dignity." It is honesty of mind or intention, freedom from simulation or hypocrisy. It restrains him from preaching what he does not believe. He is sincere in his convictions and beliefs, in his love for the word of God and for the Church, and in the expression of his sentiments and feelings. The words of Shakspeare are applicable to him:

> "His words are bonds, his oaths are oracles,
> His love sincere, his thoughts immaculate."

Let us still further analyze the general idea of *preaching* or *teaching*, as connected with the pastoral office. In Acts xx, 20, 21, we find that it is resolved into three distinct functions: 1, the αναγγέλλειν, the making known, declaring, announcing; 2, the διδάσκειν, the teaching proper; 3, the διαμαρτυρεσθαι, the personal address or exhortation, the testifying to the truth by one's own personal experience. In Matt. iv, 23, and ix, 35, it is said of Jesus, that he went about διδασκων και κηρυσσων, teaching and preaching; the κηρυσσων here implying both the αναγγέλλειν and the διαμαρτυρεσθαι, but more particularly the former.

The *first*—the αναγγέλλειν—means simply to make known, or to communicate, the revealed will of God. It is to be made known *to all men;* even to those who do not desire or accept it.

Thereby their ignorance of it is dispelled, and they can no longer plead it as an excuse for their neglect and folly. But in connection with the *αναγγέλλειν*, two things are to be noticed:

I. *Nothing should be kept back; it should comprehend the whole counsel of God.* The Apostle Paul, at his departure from the Church at Ephesus, (Acts xx, 20, 27,) makes the following solemn declaration: "*I kept nothing back* that was profitable unto you." . . . "I have not shunned to declare unto you *all the counsel of God.*" We do not speak here of those mysteries of the plan of salvation which none can comprehend; for it is self-evident that what the preacher does not know or understand, he cannot make known; what he does not possess, he cannot give. We speak here of the danger of being silent on points which he understands full well, and which he ought to declare. This danger of not declaring the whole counsel of God is the result of a man-fearing or man-pleasing spirit, or of natural timidity. It is often the greatest, when he has to preach before distinguished auditors; nor is there, generally, less danger in the presence of his stated congregations. There is always a certain class of hearers who cannot endure heart-searching discourses, and who seem to say by their very looks, if not by their words, "*Noli me tangere.*" If he touches upon popular sins and fashionable errors, he is in danger of falling into disfavor or loosing his position. But he should not yield to such temptations; otherwise how can he say with the Apostle Paul, "I am pure from the blood of all men?" and how could he give a strict account in the day of judgment?

But it may here be objected, "Is it not against all Christian courtesy and decorum to bring private affairs, of perhaps the most delicate nature, before the public? Are not the respective persons, by such a course, rather injured and soured against than won for the divine truth? Does not the minister thereby injure his usefulness?" We admit, there is a Christian sense of propriety which should always be kept sacred. Nothing is more reprehensible than the violation of what may be termed the chasteness or decorum of the pulpit. The Apostle Paul, with his refined and delicate moral sense, was a model in this respect. But it is to be observed here, that the preaching which "keeps back nothing that is profitable,"

should be done not only "*publicly*," but also "*from house to house*," or *privately*, (Acts xx, 20.) For there are things which should not be spoken "publicly," both out of respect to the person or persons concerned, and to others. But they must be said *privately*. Much may be said and accomplished *privately*, that might not be done *publicly*. And on the other hand, much may be said *publicly*, if said in the proper Christian spirit, and not after the manner of an angry, noisy declaimer, whose discourse is full of acrimonious invectives.

2. The next thing to be noticed, in connection with the ἀναγγέλλειν, is *that nothing of our own should be added to the revealed will of God.* This may be done in two ways: (1.) Such additions may be made that the strait gate may become straiter, and the narrow way narrower still. The law may be preached with such rigid severity and relentlessness that the glory of the divine grace and love is entirely obscured, and thus the sinner may be driven to hopeless despair. Religion is made to consist in the strict observance of the letter of the law. *The loving and pardoning Saviour* is lost sight of *in the inexorable Judge.* This strictly *legal* pietism is not in harmony with the tenor of the teachings of Christ and his apostles. (2.) Additions may be made in such a way as to make the narrow way wider than it really is. The word of God may be wrapped in such latitudinarian platitudes, that it no longer will prove itself "the power of God," and "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Chritianity is made to consist in a few external observances, and to be used simply as a mark of respectability. A minister thus pampering to the vicious taste of certain people, winking at their fashionable errors and follies, and crying, "Peace! Peace!" where there is no peace, is regarded by them as very popular and attractive. But such style of preaching is scarcely better than an attempt to wash people with water without making them wet. They are made to believe that they walk in the narrow way that leads to eternal life, whereas they walk in the broad way that leads to wretchedness and ruin. While the preaching of the law in its relentless severity rouses and quickens the conscience and shows the need

of a Saviour; the preaching of soft sentimentalism, insipid platitudes, and unrestricted latitudinarianism, lulls it to sleep, feeling content with the observance of a few insipid forms. So much for the *αναγγέλλειν*.

The *second element* of the general idea of preaching is the *διδάσκειν*. This properly means *teaching* or *imparting instruction*. The *διδάσκειν* presupposes that the subject-matter of the *αναγγέλλειν* has at least been heard and received; for, strictly speaking, no instruction can be given in a science of which the pupil has not yet heard. But it may be asked, "What is there yet lacking, if the subject-matter of the *αναγγέλλειν* has been willingly received?" Just here, the erroneous opinion is frequently entertained, that the mere preaching of the gospel in a general way by the minister, and its acceptance by the people, is all that is required. Hence we find so much ignorance and confusion in regard to the doctrines of Christianity, and so little real, thorough, and substantial religious experience. There is a lack of *expository preaching*. The great truths of the gospel are not sufficiently developed, explained, illustrated, and enforced. They frequently lie hid in man's heart, like the talent in the napkin, undeveloped and unapplied to the individual life. Hence, too, the lack of "observing those things," which were spoken by our Lord. And yet "the observing of those things" is really the most important thing. Our Lord has made it the principal end and object, toward which all our *teaching* should be directed, when he says in Matt. xxviii, 20, "*Teaching* them *to observe* all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" and in John xiv, 21: "He that hath my commandments, and *keepeth* them, he it is that loveth me." We see, then, that the *ἔχειν*, the having, the possession of the commandments is one thing, and the *τηρεῖν*, the keeping or observing of the same, is another. The *τηρεῖν* is to be effected by the *διδάσκειν*. Hence a twofold function is implied in the *διδάσκειν*: (1.) *The exposition*, (2,) *the application*, of the sacred text.

(1.) *Exposition* has for its object the determination, development, and illustration of the precise meaning and connection of the text, a task far more difficult than the mere *αναγγέλλειν*. We frequently find talented and distinguished ministers, who understand the *αναγγέλλειν* in a masterly manner, and who pass

through the country like a "*legio fulminea*," producing a great sensation, and causing many to awake from their sleep of sin. The results of their labor seem always to be apparent, and hence they become popular and distinguished. But when they come to the διδάσκειν, the thorough exposition of the text, they are at a loss. They have no talent for it. They can accomplish little in that department. On the other hand, ministers of fine *expository* ability may not become as popular, and the results of their labor may not be as apparent, as among the former class. And yet they really accomplish more. While the effects of the former class are generally superficial and evanescent, those of the latter are deep and lasting. They develop and nurture the spiritual life of the flock, indoctrinate them in the great truths of the gospel, and establish them in their most holy faith. Such pithy expository preaching is somewhat rare in our days. It is a desideratum in the Church. (2.) *The second function* of the διδάσκειν is *the application of the doctrines of Christianity to the various conditions and relations of life.* It is the practical talent. It consists not merely in a few arbitrary, loosely-connected practical observations, but it is the "*De te fabula narratur*," or as Nathan said to David, "Thou art the man!" In this particular many of our own ministers excel. Some of Luther's, Schleiermacher's, and Whitefield's sermons furnish excellent examples of it.

The *third element* of the general idea of preaching is the διαμαρτυρεσθαι, the testifying, the personal address and appeal, the exhortation to accept the truth of the gospel and walk in it. The Apostle Peter (Acts ii, 40) furnishes us an excellent example of it. The διαμαρτυρεσθαι always presupposes the ἀναγγέλλειν and the διδάσκειν, and should necessarily follow them. It may be regarded as the sequel of the sermon, whether delivered publicly, in a direct appeal, or privately, in the *pastoral* conversation. The objective points aimed at thereby should be *repentance* and *faith.* The preacher should ask himself: "What is the object of my preaching? What do I desire to accomplish? Is it the awakening, conversion and sanctification of my hearers? Is it to serve the Lord and the Church with all humility and patience, or to serve myself? How and by what means can I most successfully accomplish

the work assigned me by God and the Church?" In his homiletical meditations he should not so much aim at being eloquent or scholarly, or producing a sensation, as at the awakening and conversion of his hearers.

II. Having considered that part of the pastoral office which has for its object *the calling of sinners to repentance, and the instruction of the Church in the doctrines of Christianity*, let us briefly notice that other part of it, which in the New Testament is designated by the terms "επισκοπειν" or "ποιμαινειν το Ποίμνιον," "to oversee, guide, or govern the flock." This is a spiritual function. It does not so much consist in an external bureaucratic government, as in the performance of those duties and in the use of those means which tend to enhance the spiritual life of the flock and preserve them from all evil. Therefore the Apostle Paul has delivered the following charge to the bishops or elders of the Church at Ephesus (Acts xx, 28:) "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*, (επισκόπους,) to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." The same watchful care and solicitude is manifested by our Lord, when it is said by him, (Matt. ix, 36,) "But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they *fainted*, and *were scattered abroad*, as sheep having no shepherd." Here the pastor has a true model for imitation. With compassionate love for the sinner he should enter upon his work. This love for souls has its ground and origin in the *love of God toward us*, and in the knowledge of the condition of those who are "as sheep having no shepherd." Their condition is described, in the passage just quoted, as being "faint" and "scattered abroad," (εσκυλμένοι και ἐῤῥιμμένοι;) σκυλλειν means "to lacerate, fatigue, harass, exhaust, etc. This is a true description, not merely of the physical condition of the multitudes referred to by our Lord, but also of the condition of man in his natural state. He is harassed by his evil passions, perplexed by manifold worldly cares, and annoyed by the thousand little troubles and ills of life. They disturb the peace of his mind and the tranquillity of his soul. Thus his moral sensibilities become obtuse, and the sublimest truths of the gospel fail to make a right impression upon his mind. This is

especially the case when different religious (?) quacks are experimenting upon him; as it was done during and immediately after the days of our Lord, when the people were wearied with an almost endless variety of traditions and regulations. It frequently happens in our days that different views and systems of doctrine, almost diametrically opposed to each other, are advanced, so that those unaccustomed to severe reflection are scarcely able to discover the real truth, and frequently become disgusted with it. Indeed, no word describes their condition better than *εσκυλμενοι.* Every man in his natural state may be considered an *εσκυλμενος.*

The other word, *ἐῤῥιμμένοι,* (from *ῥίπτειν,*) means "to throw or cast down, to scatter, disperse, abandon," etc. We know how, in the days of our Lord, the Jews were torn by politico-religious factions. There were the political zealots, the enraged patriots, and the Roman timeservers on the one hand, and the infidel Sadducees, the orthodox Pharisees, and ascetic Essenes on the other. Whither should the poor people turn for guidance and help? There was a continued *ῥιπτειν.* And it may with propriety be said, *it is thus in our days.* Human life *to day* is more agitated than a century and a half ago. A never-resting conflict is going on upon the political and ecclesiastical arenas. Scarcely has the storm of one revolution passed away, when another one is approaching. Public and private life seem almost entirely absorbed by political parties, ecclesiastical strifes, races for wealth and position, and by an inordinate passion for amusements and luxuries. Moral and religious questions are frequently agitated in the interests of politics. We often see men, otherwise indifferent to the Church and religion, place themselves at the head of so-called religious movements, in order to make political capital. The great masses of the people, who generally have no settled convictions or principles of their own, allow themselves to be led and *fanaticised* by such politico-religious demagogues. They thus become *ἐῤῥιμμένοι.*

But notwithstanding this lamentable condition of the masses, we should not be blind to the fact that there is still some good to be found among them. And if, Christ-like, with compassionate love we anticipate the good in them, it will sooner or later become apparent. If approached with kindness

and pastoral solicitude, good impressions may be made upon their hearts, and a desire for something higher and holier awakened in them. Thus their prejudices may soon be overcome, their evil habits corrected, their unholy passions subdued, their sins forgiven, and their souls regenerated and sanctified by the influence of the Holy Spirit; so that they are no longer ἐῤῥιμμένοι, but sheep of the fold, whose shepherd and bishop is the Lord.

But just here, as our Lord intimates, seems to lie the fault for this lamentable state of affairs among the masses; namely, *the want of special pastoral care and guidance.* In the time of Christ they had the temple, they had synagogues, schools, priests, pharisees, scribes, and teachers almost without number; and yet, so far as real spiritual care was concerned, "the multitudes were as sheep without a shepherd." Thus it is in our days. We have churches, schools; missionary, Bible, tract, and temperance societies; bishops, preachers, teachers, religious literature, etc.; and yet it almost appears as if the masses of the people were "like sheep without a shepherd." Why this state of things? Is there not too much exclusiveness praticed among many Churches and pastors of the different denominations? Do they not lack, to a great extent, that spirit of holy love and zeal, and of self-consecration, that characterized Christ and his apostles? Has not the spirit of *caste* crept into the Church? Are there not some Churches and ministers who seldom, if ever, go beyond the boundaries of their local parishes in their missionary operations? The great masses of the people are indeed greatly to be blamed for their gross neglect of Christ and his salvation; yet there are many Churches and ministers who are equally blamable for not doing their *whole duty.* Let the *whole Christian Church* feel a *deep concern* for the salvation of the masses; let her use all her strength and resources, which Christ has placed at her command, for the spread of the Gospel *everywhere*, and our Lord will have no longer occasion to say, so far as the Church is concerned, that "the multitudes are as sheep without a shepherd."

III. Lastly, *let us briefly consider the third function of the pastoral office*, mentioned at the beginning of this article, namely, *the* διακονεῖν—*the serving* or *assisting* in temporal matters.

This is a function more of a *temporal than of a spiritual nature.* It implies more particularly the care of the poor, of the widows and orphans of the flock. It is evident from the writings of St. Paul, that even after he had employed deacons for this specific work, he still ministered to the necessities of the saints. And history tells us, that even during the post-apostolic time the care of the widows and orphans, and of the poor generally, was considered an important duty of the minister or bishop. While it lies in the nature of his office that he should look after the temporal welfare of the poor of his flock, yet the minister should not be burdened with the execution of the minute details connected with their care and relief. This part of the work should be done by the officers of his Church. More time is thus left him to devote to their spiritual growth. By thus exercising a watchful care over the temporal and spiritual interests of the members of his flock, can he be successful in leading them to the great Shepherd and Bishop of their souls.

From what has been said, it is evident that the success of a minister does not so much depend upon his talents as upon his *faithfulness.* Thus the Apostle Paul says, (1 Cor. iv, 1, 2,) "that it is required in ministers and stewards of the mysteries of God, that they be found *faithful.*" Now, this *faithfulness*, like *faith*, has two sides—*subjective* and *objective.* One may be entirely correct in the "*fides quæ creditur*," but not in the "*fides qua creditur;*" and *vice versa*, there may be a living "*fides qua creditur*," while the "*fides quæ creditur*" may contain some errors. Thus it is with *faithfulness* in office. *Subjective* faithfulness implies not only an *earnest desire to*, but an "I WILL" save souls. *Objective* faithfulness implies more. It implies the *realization* of that earnest desire by *constant efforts*, the carrying out of the "I WILL" *into practice.* The former is the parent of the latter. Both imply *orthodox* teaching, *judicious* governing, and *impartial* ministering to the temporal necessities. They imply a correct exposition of the doctrines of Christianity, a judicious application of its precepts to the various conditions and relations of life, and a watchful care over the temporal as well as spiritual interests of those who shall be heirs of salvation. Such faithfulness will be rewarded with great success. Such was the faithfulness of our Lord.

Art. VI.—THE WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY: Dr. A. W. SMITH.

Half a century has scarcely elapsed since the Methodist Episcopal Church commenced the movement in collegiate education, which at this centenary moment in her history demands so much attention.

Wesleyan Methodism from its very beginning promoted education, and as early as 1739 John Wesley founded "Kingswood School," enjoining, in the Larger Minutes, on his fellow-laborers to "preach expressly on education." The fathers of American Methodism adopted the same excellent rule at the Christmas Conference in 1784, when the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized.

Mr. Asbury, previous to the session of this Conference, consulted Dr. Coke respecting the establishment of a school for the education of the preachers' sons and orphan children, with such others as might avail themselves of its privileges. Dr. Coke, himself an *Oxonian*, preferred a *college*, when the Conference adopted his view. In the year 1785, the corner-stone of a large brick building was laid at Abingdon, Md., about twenty-five miles from Baltimore, some five thousand dollars having been obtained for the undertaking. It is here worthy of record, that Bishop Asbury became the first college agent in American Methodism, going forth from the Conference after his ordination, preaching and making collections for this institution; and since then he has had many worthy successors in the same educational work. This institution was named "Cokesbury College," and in a short period the bishops published their "Plan of Education in Cokesbury College," being an elaborate presentation of its objects, and system of instruction. The purpose was to educate the preachers' sons and poor orphans, as well as to furnish "a seminary for the children of our competent friends, where learning and religion may go hand in hand." It was placed under the presidency of the bishops, and to be supported by the yearly collections of the Churches, and voluntary donations. In the curriculum we find embraced English, Latin, Greek, logic, rhetoric, history, geography, natural philosophy, and astronomy. Hebrew,

French, and German were to be added when the funds would permit. This was certainly a liberal course. As the founders wished "to have the opportunity of teaching their pupils' young ideas how to shoot, and gradually forming their minds, through the divine blessing, almost from their infancy, to holiness and heavenly wisdom, as well as human learning," scholars were to be admitted at an age as early as seven years.

The good bishops also established stringent college rules: among them, early rising and retiring, hard beds, as feathers were truly esteemed unhealthy; there was to be *no play*, but the recreations embraced walking, riding, bathing, without doors, while within the students were allowed the business of the carpenter, joiner, cabinet-maker, and turner for their leisure moments. The young institution had plenty of such regulations. We consider it a great evil for any college to have a forward and officious body of trustees or visitors, who assume to direct all its internal economy, ever ready and not unwilling to "discipline" the faculty for thinking themselves capable of managing the charge committed to them. We have met such and found them very unpleasant "committee men." An able faculty, with few rules and large discretion, constitutes the best security for a prosperous and well-managed institution. In Cokesbury the bishops, with a "*Committee of Safety*," had both faculty and students under their especial government. We wonder not that Asbury declared himself relieved of a great burden when the fire took this college from his shoulders.

He wrote on the occurrence of this catastrophe: "Its enemies may rejoice and its friends need not mourn. Would any man give me ten thousand pounds (this sum was lost by the accident) a year, to do and suffer again what I have done for that house, I would not do it." In December, 1787, a little over three quarters of a century since, the institution was inaugurated by a "three day's meeting," Bishop Asbury delivering the first sermon, from a text somewhat prognostic, "O thou man of God, there is death in the pot." Eight years afterward, in December, 1795, the edifice was burned to the ground. Dr. Coke, however, not discouraged, revived the scheme in the "Washington College," founded at Baltimore,

when fire soon also swept away this edifice. After this, for some years, the Methodist Episcopal Church made no advance in founding collegiate institutions, but schools in different sections of our land were established under Methodist auspices, and some of them taught by their preachers. Such an academy was commenced about the year 1817, at New Market, New Hampshire, under the patronage of the New England Conference, and one in New York city, 1819, by the New York Conference. The friends of these literary institutions, in the year 1820, to secure the influence of the General Conference, petitioned for a change in the Discipline which would permit the appointment of traveling preachers to take charge of such institutions, and this alteration was then made.

This conference also adopted resolutions for denominational education, and being the earliest on the important subject from our highest ecclesiastical body, we may properly reproduce them here:

1. *Resolved*, That it be, and it is hereby recommended to all the annual conferences to establish, as soon as practicable, literary institutions, under their own control, in such a way and manner as they may think proper.

2. *Resolved*, That it be the special duty of the episcopacy to use their influence to carry the above resolution into effect, by recommending the subject to each annual conference.

Doubtless this report then added new impulse to the educational movements in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and its first result was the erection of private schools under the patronage of our own denomination. As early as the year 1817, Dr. Martin Ruter had started a literary institution at New Market, New Hampshire, which is still distinguished as the Wilbraham School, Massachusetts; and in 1819 another, in New York city, afterward transferred to White Plains, of which the Rev. John M. Smith, of the New York Conference, was the principal. He was one of the earliest professors in the Wesleyan University. Another such seminary was at Mount Ariel, South Carolina; and here, in 1821, the revered Olin was converted, and, it would seem, the result of his endeavors to carry out the wishes of Methodist patrons, by introducing religious instruction and prayer among the pupils. To give such a man to the Church was honor enough for that unpretending academy.

Our Southwest can claim the credit of founding the earliest Methodist college. In the year 1822, Augusta College, Kentucky, was chartered, and its edifice erected, 1825; Madison, in Pennsylvania, organized in 1827; the former under the patronage of the Kentucky, and the latter, the Pittsburgh Conference. The Rev. Henry B. Bascom, afterward bishop of the Church South, was connected with both: with the latter, as its president. Both have ceased to exist, doubtless for want of proper endowment and patronage. The place of Madison College has been successfully supplied by Alleghany, in Western Pennsylvania. Augusta College commenced, as above said, under the patronage of the Kentucky and Ohio Conferences, Martin Ruter, president, H. B. Bascom, J. S Tomlinson, J. P. Durbin, and Burr H. M'Cown, professors; all members of the Kentucky Conference except Dr. Durbin, who belonged to the Ohio.

In the year 1824 the General Conference authorized an academy for both sexes at Cazenovia, New York, and during 1825 the New Market was merged into the Wilbraham, where the Rev. Wilbur Fisk, of precious memory, soon developed his great abilities as an instructor of youth. This institution was under the New England Conference patronage. In the Southwest, a little later, the Tennessee Conference had originated La Grange College, appointing the Rev. R. Paine, now bishop of the Church South, "superintendent," and the Rev. E. D. Sims, one of its professors.

During the year 1829 the Virginia Conference projected Randolph Macon College. As an historical fact, the writer of this article may here add, that at that period, spending part of his time in Petersburg, Virginia, he there introduced into the Quarterly Conference a resolution, which was adopted, recommending such an institution. By request he also prepared a printed address on the subject, and this was extensively circulated. Mr. Olin, who had for several years filled the chair of Belles-lettres at Franklin College, Georgia, in the year 1832 accepted the presidency of Randolph Macon, and was inaugurated March 5, 1834, and he soon acquired the same literary influence here as he had before in South Carolina and Georgia. But his health being very infirm, he continued the presidency only three years, and at the commencement in

June, 1836, he was barely able to confer the degrees on the graduates. The Rev. Martin P. Parks, of the Virginia Conference, was also a professor in Randolph Macon. He was a cadet graduate of West Point, a man of marked talent and zeal. He afterward took orders in the Episcopal Church, and after serving as Bishop Meade's assistant in Norfolk, Virginia, he was called to Trinity and St. Paul's, New York, in whose faithful service he died after a few years.

In the year 1831 the WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY at Middletown, Connecticut, under the patronage of the New York, New Hampshire, and Vermont Conferences, was opened, the able and excellent Dr. Wilbur Fisk, S. T. D., president, with Augustus W. Smith, Rev. John Mott Smith, and Rev. Jacob Frederick Huber, professors. This is our oldest college, being the first of all the attempts that proved a permanent success. Able and successful professors in the University have been added to the faculty since, but for our present object we need add no later record. The buildings had been erected and used for a military school, and becoming vacant, were offered to the conferences. These were valued at $30,000, to which amount, the citizens of the place added about $18,000. With such an outfit it was not difficult for this university to surpass other Methodist colleges, which although projected earlier, had to make every preparation to commence their educational work. After Dr. Fisk's death, the Rev. Nathan Bangs, S.T.D., was elected president and resigned in 1842. The Rev. Joseph Cummings was elected in 1857. Its first graduating class, in the year 1833, embraced *six* members, and that of 1865, *thirty-five*, and the whole number to the same period, nine hundred and ninety-four.

This institution was formally opened on the 21st of September, 1831, Dr. Fisk delivering an inaugural address. His theme was the "Science of Education." At the next annual commencement D. D. Whedon, having been elected the professor of Ancient Languages, chose for the subject of his Inaugural, "Classical Studies." Both were didactic, eloquent discourses. They lie before me. In the conclusion of the president's address, he observed "$200,000 ought *now* to be at the disposal of the trustees. It has been thought that ages were necessary to raise up such an institution. But in this enterprise

we must make no such tardy and distant calculations. . . . . In the name and strength of the Lord we can do it. And we here declare, in the presence of this audience, that we dedicate to God, whose blessing and aid we implore most devoutly, and expect most confidently, this enterprise. His are the first fruits, and his, be it great or small, shall be the full harvest." Abundant has been the harvest since, and Methodism now has a most honorable place in the history of American colleges and schools.

The educational provisions from the first year of Methodism to our own times, have been productive of incalculable good; and could this great religious system point the world to no other proofs of its usefulness, these alone would secure its claims, as one of the most remarkable and efficient means of Christian advancement both in England and America. All the former presidents of the Wesleyan University, Drs. Fisk, Olin, Smith, and Bangs have passed away to the abodes of more than earthly knowledge, but the present excellent and learned Dr. Cummings, at its head, is permitted to see how the little grain of mustard seed planted at Middletown, has become a great tree in our land, spreading its useful shade and branches far and wide.* Academies, colleges, with theological Seminaries, have sprung up so rapidly, until the Methodist Episcopal Church officially reports as many as twenty-five colleges, including two theological schools, with 5,345 students and 158 instructors.

*The following summary will give some idea how much this mother of our colleges has accomplished during her short existence of little more than a quarter of a century.

Whole number of alumni	1,010
" " " deceased	132
" " " still living	878
Number of ministers	456
" " deceased	56
" " living	400
Presidents of colleges	13
Ex-presidents	7
Professors of colleges	31
Ex-professors	26
Tutors	8
Principals of academies	32

$805,239 property and endowments, with 105,331 volumes in their libraries. It has also eighty-four seminaries and academies, with 617 teachers and 17,945 scholars. Their property is estimated at $1,643,000. There are two Methodist Episcopal theological schools, with 125 students and 9 professors, one at Concord, New Hampshire, about to be removed to the neighborhood of Boston, and the other at Evanston, Illinois; and their property has been estimated to be worth $450,000. The Southern division of the denomination reported, before the late war, twelve colleges and seventeen academies, with 8,000 students, making an aggregate for Methodism in the United States of 225 literary institutions, having 35,305 scholars.

This is certainly a very remarkable and favorable exhibit of the denomination in its educational efforts. In this respect Methodism may be properly ranked as a providential adaptation to the wants of the New World. And wisely has the General Conference, among other objects, proposed to commemorate its CENTENARY by raising a permanent fund for education. Our entire national white population in the year 1860, numbered 26,957,471, and under twenty years of age 12,614,637. Hence our teachers plainly hold in their hands great destinies of the land. In less than seventy rolling years our population will surpass all the millions of Europe, and as our educators have under their control a large portion of the population, how vastly important their trust, what human destinies will they control! With such solemn responsibilities for the moral and intellectual progress of our country, the present Church jubilee should raise a monumental fund for education, worthy of the great occasion, to strengthen its numerous colleges, and to aid new ones which will spring up as the country advances.

AUGUSTUS WILLIAM SMITH was chosen the professor of mathematics and astronomy in the Wesleyan University in the year 1831. But how swiftly pass away from our earthly society and scenes the beloved, the learned, with the useful and the pious. Prof. J. M. Smith, Dr. Fisk, and Dr. Olin, all sweetly rest in the beautiful rural cemetery of the Wesleyan University, while Dr. A. W. Smith sleeps in glorious hope, with the departed, according to his own last request, at Cazenovia, N. Y.

A most intimate and beloved friend, now gone to the heavenly rewards, most useful and able scholar, and humble Christian, in his day and generation, it is one object of the present article to speak of his honored life and example. That life has been devoted to the noble cause of education, and it well deserves a record. He was a good and true man, who has honored Methodism by his high reputation and varied services to her institutions, and whose educational influences have formed and blessed many minds and hearts of our day.

Dr. Smith was a native of Herkimer County, N. Y., and born May 12, 1802; his father a respectable farmer, a man of strong mind and influence, a leading member in the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose friendly house was ever the welcome home of the itinerant. Under the preparation of the Rev. Dr. Wicks, Paris Hill, N. Y., he entered the freshmen class of Hamilton College, and in scholarship he had no superiors among his classmates, graduating with the highest honors in the year 1825. He was engaged immediately as a teacher in the Cazenovia Seminary of the Oneida Conference, just then established, and soon after elected its Principal.

He professed faith in the Saviour while at college, and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon dedicated his talents and life to the advancement and perfecting that extensive system of education which now is imparting such glory and strength to American Methodism. While at Cazenovia, Mr. Smith was married to Catharine Childs, the daughter of the Hon. Perry G. Childs of that place, and his excellent lady, with two sons and two daughters, survives him. In all the endearing relations of husband and father he was most happy, and we have often enjoyed the refined and Christian friendship of his pious household.

In 1850 Hamilton College, his *alma mater*, conferred on him the degree of LL.D., and afterward the same honor was bestowed by Rutgers College, N. J., and also by a Southern University. During the sickness and absence of Dr. Fisk he often discharged the responsibility of president of the Wesleyan University with great fidelity and success, securing the sincere attachment of the students. What increased the inter-

est and value of his class exercises, was his concise, clear, and beautiful method and talent of imparting knowledge and science. No one, we can imagine, could excel him in the faculty of fixing the attention of the pupil to the subject before him, so that he could grasp its difficulties and understand them. By natural genius and patient study Dr. Smith became eminently qualified for teaching, particularly in his own special professorship. With an exalted sense of the value of the sciences he taught, and with simple and direct methods, he could not fail, in spite of frequent ill health, to become, as he did, a successful and able teacher. Scholarly and learned, clear in perception and statement, vigilant, gentle, and gentlemanly, he always secured affection, respect, and confidence. He was everywhere unostentatious and quiet; still, in the highest circles of education and science, among his literary peers, his superior worth was cheerfully acknowledged.

In 1849 Dr. Smith published an "*Elementary Treatise on Mechanics*," a valuable text-book for undergraduates, and a second edition was issued in 1858. He was one of the astronomical corps sent by the U. S. government to Labrador to make observations upon the annular eclipse of the sun, and the well-known learned Prof. Bache at the time stated that some of them were of great scientific value. In 1852 he was chosen President of the Wesleyan University, the successor to the lamented and eloquent Dr. Olin. Accustomed to the duties of this important office, he performed them with distinguished fidelity and talent. Although not eminently gifted as a public speaker, his words were often impressive and effective. In 1859 he received the appointment of Professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy in the United States' Naval Academy at Annapolis, which he retained until his decease. In this national school, the last scene of his labors, his intellectual and moral worth will long be remembered. At his death the *National Intelligencer* contained a communication on the sorrowful occasion, refering to his other characteristics besides those of the able teacher.

"As head of the department of natural philosophy, by his high attainments, and no less by his quiet energy, he contributed largely to the efficiency of the naval academy as a

school for educating young men for discharging the responsible duties of naval officers.

"As an instructor he was a model. His style and method were clear and luminous. Laborious in the preparation of his lectures, he was at all times ready to impart information. His manner in the lecture-room was highly attractive. He never, by act, or word, or look disparaged the efforts or undervalued the acquirements of his pupils. Earnest and thorough, his perfect mastery of the branches taught, and his skill and long experience, enabled him to develop the minds of those committed to his charge to an unusual degree.*

"As an associate, his uniform courtesy, his high moral character, his ripe judgment, and kindness of heart made him very dear to us. We knew him not only as an officer, but as a friend.

"In the relation of husband and father he was most happy, and in his death we feel the loss of daily Christian example. We realize, in sorrow, that a noble man has been taken away, and a favorite teacher has been transferred from the halls

*Let us here append a brief tribute to one of the most brilliant graduates of the Wesleyan, whose death has just been announced in the Southern Methodist papers —JOHN W. BURRUS, Esq., of Woodville, Mississippi. He belonged to one of the earliest classes that graduated under Wilbur Fisk. Without a contestant, and by unanimous concurrence, he took the highest honors of his class. With singular distinctness, amid a crowd of long past events, we remember the delivery of his Valedictory. His slender figure acquired a peculiar awkward dignity from its overtallness; and his elocution, in fact, derived a specially effective emphasis from a slight impediment. He truly and unaffectedly blended in his character that romantic sense of honor in which the Southron prides himself, with that firm sense of *right* which the Northman considers the proper base of action and character. The Faculty at Middletown would have gladly nominated him to a Professor's chair, but a sense of duty to those whom the "peculiar institution" of the South had placed in his hand, compelled him to decline. He returned home to immure himself in the conscientious office of guarding his charge, like a faithful *servus servorum*, so that he filled not the high destiny of his early promise. During these past terrible years, when civil war was howling with all its horrors around his home, his fragile figure has often risen before our imagination, and we have inquired of those who might possibly be informed what were the results to him. He survived the perils of war, peacefully to die amid the scenes of returning peace. Master and scholar, SMITH and BURRUS, often associated in life, were in death but briefly divided. The testimony of his friends is that, as a pillar in his home Church, he maintained a spotless Christian dignity. As our eye seems to gaze into the dim past we drop an involuntary tear to his memory. Had all slaveholders been like him there would have been no war, and slavery would have—*still stood in its might!*—ED.

of instruction, to that better home which awaits those who are faithful to their work here."

The Rev. Edward Otheman, who knew him intimately for many years, thus expresses himself in Zion's Herald.

"The general, spontaneous expression of appreciative regret and sorrow at the loss to society occasioned by his death, bears pleasing evidence of the marked impression made by his pure and dignified character and life. The closing hours of such a life were eminently fitting and affecting."

The Rev. Dr. Henry Bannister, another devoted friend, and one of the earliest graduates of the departed professor, beautifully remarks:

"Dr. Smith chose the profession of a teacher as his life's work—a work quite as free as the Christian ministry from sordidness in its aims, and scarcely less subject to toilsomeness, self-denial, and sacrifice. As an educator, few, if any, could anywhere be found superior to him. No one could excel him in the power of holding the student to a firm and successful grapple with the subject before him, whether in pure mathematics or in physical science. His shrewd insight into the powers and the fidelity of the young men that came before him, gave interest and animation to all diligent students. . . . His words, neither too few nor too many, were always apposite, and of precisely that kind of force which informs sufficiently, but *educates* excellently."

Layman as he was, with a distinguished reputation as a scholar or teacher, the Methodist Episcopal Church owes Dr. Smith a grateful remembrance for his standing by her during all the years of her weakness in educational enterprises. He was ever ready and willing to render his services to strengthen our denominational character in respectability and influence. In his religious life he strikingly exhibited a calmness of trust in God; and a demeanor chastened with exemplary piety. Resplendently did these heavenly virtues shine, both at home and abroad, in a godly life and a daily living example of Christian affection and urbanity.

During the last years of his earthly work, especially, he labored on faithfully until his final illness, of pneumonia, terminated somewhat suddenly in death. His brief sickness excited no apprehension of its alarming character, until the

last day or two. Congestion of the lungs then appearing, the attack became swiftly fatal; and few closing scenes of human life have been more cheering or beautiful. At this solemn moment none of his family were present, except Mrs. Smith and their elder daughter, and to these he expressed the most cheering assurances of his readiness to depart and be forever with the Lord. On the last evening, March 21st, when the physician informed the family of his probable death, and he also knew this belief, closing his eyes for a few moments, he calmly said, "The parting is not for long; it is only like saying good evening, and soon it will be good morning for us all;" and afterward he added, "You all know how I have tried to live, and what has been my aim in life. For myself I have no fears for the future." The twenty-third Psalm was repeated to him, and he joined audibly in the verse, "*Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me,*" and these comforting lines consoled him in death, as they always had in life. A favorite hymn of his, "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand," was sung, he joining in the first stanza; and so bright and peaceful was his countenance at the moment, that he seemed to behold his "Father's face" on high. In lowly and trustful assurance of the Saviour's love, he afterward responded to those animating lines, which have cheered so many myriads in life and while passing the Jordan of death,

"Rock of ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in thee."

Soon after midnight the "change came." The chaplain was praying, and one present kneeling says, "I looked up and saw as it had been the face of an angel. And so he was at rest, when exactly, no one knew, not even the kind doctor who stood near."

Thus has disappeared from among us a noble, true, and good man, the gentleman, the scholar, and the Christian. It is fitting that at least this record should be made, in our highest literary periodical, of one whose life was devoted to the cause of higher education in the Church and nation.

ART. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

HISTORY OF THE COLENSO CASE—ANOTHER JUDICIAL DECISION IN FAVOR OF DR. COLENSO.—Dr. Colenso has succeeded in obtaining from the English courts another judgment in his favor, the Master of the Rolls having decided that the Trustees of the "Colonial Bishoprics Fund" have to pay to Dr. Colenso the arrears of his salary. The proceedings arose out of the judgment of the Privy Council on the "Colenso Case," in March, 1865. The Judicial Committee did not indeed negative the right of Bishop Colenso to assume the Episcopal character, or that of Bishop Gray to call himself Metropolitan of the South African Church; but they denied that any coercive jurisdiction could be exercised by either, inasmuch as the patents which purported to confer that jurisdiction were null and void in law. They declared that "there was no power in the Crown, by virtue of its prerogative, to establish a metropolitan see or province, or to create an ecclesiastical corporation, whose *status*, rights, and authority the colony should be bound to recognize." "It may be true that the Crown, as legal head of the Church, has a right to command the consecration of a bishop, but it has no power to assign him any diocese, or give him any sphere of action," either within the United Kingdom, or within any colony which has received legislative institutions, unless by special provisions of an act of Parliament.

Upon the delivery of this judgment Bishop Colenso applied to the Trustees of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund for the arrears of the income annually payable out of that fund to the bishopric of Natal, which had been withheld and carried to a separate account since his deposition in the previous year. The trustees, on the other hand, contended that "inasmuch as Bishop Colenso was not a suffragan bishop within the province of Capetown, he was not a bishop at all in the sense contemplated by the original promoters of the fund, and could receive no benefit from it."

In giving his judgment the Master of the Rolls (Lord Romilly) said:

The Archbishop of Canterbury was directed to consecrate a Bishop of Natal; he did so, and thus gave Dr. Colenso full power as an English bishop. He (Lord Romilly) did not mean to say that Bishop Colenso could not be removed from his bishopric on account of immorality or of abandonment of the Christian faith, but such a matter had not been raised. If it had he might have been compelled to decide it. As the case had been placed before him he must decide that the prayer of the plaintiff's bill must be granted, and that the defendants must pay the costs. At the same time he thought the trustees had acted properly in raising the question, and Dr. Colenso must pay the costs of the Attorney-General and the personal costs of the trustees.

The important point, as regards the doctrine of the Anglican Church, is that a bishop, however much he may offend against the doctrines or modes of Christianity, cannot be removed without the consent of the Crown. In the meanwhile the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the request of the diocese of Natal, has nominated another bishop, who will take the title of Bishop of Maritzburg. All the bishops of South Africa will concur in his consecration.

HIGH CHURCH TENDENCIES—PROGRESS OF THE "INTERCOMMUNION" TENDENCIES—THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM—THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION—THE FEELING IN RUSSIA WITH REGARD TO INTERCOMMUNION—THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN ICELAND AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH—THE GREEK CHURCH MAKING INROADS UPON ANGLICAN TERRITORY.—The Anglican "Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom," the object of which is to unite the Roman, Greek, and Anglican Churches, and which is the most ultra High-Church society of England, celebrated, on the 8th of September, its ninth anniversary. The religious worship on this occasion could hardly be distinguished from that used in the Roman Catholic Churches. The society has been very active, and it seems not altogether unsuccessful, for it is stated that the anniversary was celebrated in "several hundred churches" with special services and sermons.

One of the youngest High-Church Societies of the English Church is that

called the "Eastern Church Association," and which confines its efforts to bringing about a closer union between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches. The first annual report of the association, which has recently been published, contains some interesting statements. Thus we learn from it that negotiations are pending for a reunion between the Greek and the Armenian Churches, and an account of their negotiations and of the divisions between the two Churches, written by the Greek Metropolitan of Chios, is given in the report. The Association has presented a letter of Christian and brotherly greeting to the Synod of the Armenian Patriarchate, assembled at Constantinople for the election of a new "Catholicos" (head of the Armenian Church) at Etschmiadzine. The Patriarch of Constantinople, as President of the Synod, received the letter with great kindness and courtesy. The Association has two hundred and eighty members, and among its patrons are English, Scotch, Colonial, American, and also two Servian bishops.

On the feeling in Russia, with regard to intercommunion, we receive new and interesting information in an address delivered by the Bishop of Moray and Ross (of the Scotch Episcopal Church) to his clergy, after his return from a special mission to Russia. According to the bishop's statement the interest taken by the Russians in the measures for bringing about a complete practical union among the Episcopalian Churches of England, America, and Russia is deep and universal. Among those who expressed themselves in this way, the bishop mentions in particular the Grand Duke Constantine, the brother of the Emperor.

The High-Church organs are highly gratified that the new (Lutheran) Bishop of Iceland, Dr. Pieturson, who was consecrated at Copenhagen on the 3d of June, earnestly desired the assistance of an Anglican bishop of England or the United States. The Danish authorities would not permit it, but the discussion of the question they think has paved the way for a more favorable result at another time.

The Scotch Episcopalians are highly elated at the address made by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the laying of the foundation stone of the Cathedral at Inverness, Scotland, in October. At the banquet following the religious ceremony, the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church adverted to the fact that what had been done that day was wholly without precedent in Scotland. The Scottish Church, he said, has received the highest possible encouragement from the kind act which the archbishop has this day performed, recognizing in this public way the direct and close intercommunion between the great Church of England and the Episcopal Church of Scotland. In the course of his response the archbishop said: "I rejoice to be able to give testimony to my anxious desire to seal the union and communion between the Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Church of England. That Episcopal Church is the only true representative of the Church of England in Scotland, and I think it well that it should be understood that the prelates of the English Church pretend to exercise no jurisdiction over clergymen in Scotland." Among the other speakers on the occasion was the Bishop of North Carolina.

The deference which the High-Church party are showing to the Greek Church has led to a curious incident. A person has appeared in England who claims to be an Eastern bishop, the "Bishop of Jona," and to have received authority to ordain bishops, priests, and deacons in England. The Bishop of Jona (Right Rev. Jules Ferrelle) was originally a Roman Catholic priest, who a few years ago made a profession of Protestantism at Damascus, and was employed there as a missionary by the Presbyterian Church of the North of Ireland. This connection he has again left for the purpose of joining the Greek Church. He has recently preached at a chapel of the Anglican Benedictines at Bristol, taking the ground that the Eastern Church was the only one that had never changed its doctrines, and that it stood on a broad and exalted platform from which it could not descend to unite with other Churches, but which was large enough to receive all others to itself. Its terms of acceptance, too, were easier than those of any other Church, for it asked only one question, namely, whether the person wishing to join it was a believer in the Nicene Creed.

One Anglican clergyman, the Rev. G. Ouseley, makes the following curious statement concerning his profession of the Greek creed and the Scotch liturgy:

I have abandoned the Anglican Communion Office and the "filioque" too, and that for at least the last two years. It is also my intention to continue in the course I have adopted. I use the liturgy of 1549, and also the Scotch liturgy sometimes, and I deem either of these far preferable to the defective office of the Anglican Church, reformed from the ancient office and then deformed by Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer. I know quite well that by this avowal I shall most certainly deprive myself of all hope of preferment in the Anglican Church; but truth is better than gain. I know I shall shock my friends of the advanced ritual school; but Catholic rites are to my mind, and in the eyes of all true ritualists, of more importance than a slavish imitation of Roman ceremonies as prescribed by "the Conregation of Rites." My reasons for my deliberate course are these: 1. The Sign of the Cross; 2. The Oblation of the Sacrifice; 3. The Invocation of the Holy Spirit; and 4. Prayers for the Departed, are clearly and without doubt apostolic, scriptural, and catholic. These are to be found in every liturgy, without exception, from apostolic times; and, though the Jesuits tried to eliminate from the Roman liturgy the invocation, there it has remained in substance, and the Western Church still possesses the Sanctification of the Sacrifice in common with all the rest of Christendom, the last three centuries of the Anglican Church excepted.

The Evangelical Alliance.—The General Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, which was to have taken place this year in Holland, has been postponed to a later year, owing to the fear of cholera, which, about the time when the meeting was to have been held, broke out in the large cities of Holland, as well as in other countries. The British branch of the Alliance, however, met as usual to celebrate its twentieth Annual Conference. The meeting took place at Bath, and was very well attended. Among the most notable features of the Conference was the address of Rev. Dr. M'Cosh, who, in the spring of 1866, visited our country in the service of the Alliance, and for the special purpose of effecting the establishment of an American branch. In this he was successful. A branch of the Alliance was organized in New York, embracing members of all the more important evangelical denominations of our country. Dr. M'Cosh gave a glowing account of his visit to the United States, which elicited a general and deep interest. The failure of the American Churches, heretofore, to take an active part in the organization and the operations of the Alliance, Dr. M'Cosh attributed chiefly to the existence of slavery, which alienated the Churches of the South from those of the North, and he warmly expressed his joy at the removal of slavery in consequence of the war—a sentiment which met with the loud and unanimous applause of the Conference, for, as is well known, as regards slavery, there is no difference of opinion among the Christians of Europe. An interesting report was also made to the Conference on the action of the Alliance in the cause of religious liberty. It was stated that the intercession of the Council of the Alliance in behalf of the persecuted Nestorians in Persia had been a perfect success, and that the Shah had promised to relieve all their grievances. And not only had a stop been put to their persecution, but the Shah had granted a site for a new Nestorian church, and the leading merchants in Teheran had united with the prime minister of the Persian government, and with the representatives of the British, French, Turkish, and Russian governments, in presenting donations toward this object. A salutary influence had also been exercised upon the governments of Russia and Austria in behalf of Dissenters. The obstacles to the progress of Protestant Christianity in Pagan and Roman Catholic countries are still many, and the growth of Protestant missions is, on that account, in most countries slow. But the example of Persia and other countries shows how much proper exertions on the part of the Protestant Churches, aided, as they ought to be, by the moral influence of the governments of Protestant nations, may do toward the removal of these obstacles.

FRANCE.

General Synod of Evangelical Churches.—The Biennial Synod of the Evangelical Free Churches of France held its regular biennial session at Nismes from October 25 to 31. This body separated from the Reformed State Church of France in 1848 on account of the toleration in that Church of a large rationalistic party. They have since advanced steadily, and at this year's General Synod about ninety members were present. The Rev. Dr. E. de Pressensé, well known throughout the Protestant world as one of the ablest

theological writers of Europe, was elected President. Delegates were present from the Irish Presbyterian Church, the Free Church of Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the Old School Presbyterian Church of the United States, and the Vaudois Church of Italy. The meeting was regarded as a great success. Nismes, the stronghold of Protestantism in Southern France, had never before seen such a meeting in its walls, and it was hoped that the cause of orthodox Protestantism would be greatly benefited by the meeting.

BRAZIL.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN BRAZIL — ORGANIZATION OF THE PRESBYTERY OF RIO DE JANEIRO.— In former numbers of the Methodist Quarterly Review we have given the history of the German Protestant missions in Brazil and other South American countries, and the spreading of Protestantism in South and Central America in general. The growth of Protestantism in these countries, chiefly owing to the immigration of Protestants, is much more rapid than in any Roman Catholic country of the Old World, and the time seems rapidly to approach when the chief Protestant denominations of the United States will be represented in all the South American states. In fact, if we take into consideration how radically the immigration of millions of Protestants must affect the religious condition of those countries, the hope seems not to be too sanguine that soon many or most of those countries will become predominantly Protestant. One of the most interesting contributions to the history of Protestantism in South America we have ever met with, is an account by the Rev. Mr. Simonton, the pioneer missionary of the Old School Presbyterian Church, of the history of the Presbyterian missions. The account was presented to the Synod of Baltimore, which, at its annual meeting in 1866, received the newly formed Presbytery of Rio de Janeiro under its care. The following are the most important points of the report:

In 1859 the Rev. A. G. Simonton, of the Presbytery of Carlisle, reached Rio de Janeiro, not knowing whether it would be possible to preach publicly to the natives. In July, 1860, he was joined by the Rev. A. S. Blackford and wife, of the Presbytery of Washington, from which date regular services were held in the English language.

In December of the same year Mr. Simonton made a journey to the province of San Paulo. Finding thousands of German Protestants located in colonies in various parts of the province, without any of the means of grace, it seemed that a missionary to them would find an open door into the heart of Brazil. To this work the Board of Missions appointed the Rev. F. J. C. Schneider, who arrived at his post in December, 1861.

Meanwhile a native service had been begun in Rio, in addition to the English service already mentioned. Two were present at the first meeting, young men whose acquaintance Mr. Simonton had made by announcing gratuitous lessons in English. One of these was our first convert, and is now a deacon. The number of attendants increased gradually, ranging from six to twenty-five for many months. At present we frequently have audiences of one hundred and fifty.

In January, 1862, the Lord's Supper was celebrated for the first time, one American and one native convert being received as the first fruits of our mission. Since that date the communion has been regularly administered, and converts received on every occasion except one. At present there are upon the roll of the Church of Rio de Janeiro fifty-four names, and two have been dismissed by certificate to other Churches. Of these, all are either Portuguese or native Brazilians except seven, and all have been received upon profession of their faith except three.

Early in October, 1863, a new station was begun by the removal of Mr. Blackford to San Paulo, the capital of the adjoining province, about three hundred miles distant from Rio de Janeiro, and the seat of a law school, attended by some five hundred young men from all parts of the empire. There he opened a room in his hired house, and has regularly preached the Gospel with encouraging success. A Church organization has been effected, and fifteen converts received to its communion. The number of hearers increases, and our faith that great results will be achieved is being confirmed. In one of his journeys Blackford made the acquaintance of a Romish priest, known to be evangelical in his views, and, as the result, this man is now an ordained minister of our Church, doing good service for the cause of Christ.

Toward the close of 1865 a third Church was organized at Brotas, in San Paulo, formerly the parish of Senhor Conceicao, the priest already mentioned. Eleven were received at the first communion, and seven at a succeeding.

The Presbytery of Rio de Janeiro thus consists of three churches, only one of which, the church of Rio, has elected ruling elders and deacons.

Further to extend our influence, a bimonthly religious paper was begun in November, 1864, the *Imprensa Evangelica*. Of five hundred subscribers, the majority are Roman Catholics, and, from the start, the paper has been well nigh self-sustaining.

At the annual meeting of our mission in the beginning of the present year, January 16, 1866, we formed ourselves into a Presbytery, with a view to examine and ordain Senhor Conceicao in compliance with the usages of our Church. At a subsequent meeting, held in Rio de Janeiro in July, George Chamberlain was ordained. Including the Rev. Mr. Pires, since arrived, the Presbytery consists of six ministers.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

TWO NEW ALLOCUTIONS — THE REFORMATORY MOVEMENTS IN ITALY. — The temporal power of the Pope is rapidly drawiug to a close, and may possibly have been fully overthrown by the time when these lines reach our readers. The occupation of Rome by the French ceased on December 11, and no other government of Europe has the power to interfere in the settlement of this question. On October 29 the Pope again delivered two of those violent allocutions, to which the decline of the papal influence is so largely due. In the first the Pope deplores the persecutions of the Church by the Italian government, the suppression of religious orders, the secularization of the ecclesiastical property, and the law of civil marriage. All these acts he condemns, and declares to be null and void, and repeats the censures of the Church against their authors. Nevertheless he declares that he accords his benediction to Italy. The Pope further protests against the invasion and usurpation of the Pontifical provinces, and against the revolutionary project of making Rome the capital of the new kingdom. He states that the temporal power is indispensable to the independence of the spiritual power, and declares that he is ready even to suffer death for the maintenance of the sacred rights of the Holy See, and, if necessary, to seek in another country the requisite security for the better exercise of his apostolic ministry. Finally, the Pope prays that Italy may repent of the evils she has brought upon the Church. In the second allocution the Pope states that the Russian government has violated the Concordat of 1848, and recalls the persecutions exercised against the Archbishop of Warsaw, the suppression in the dioceses of bishops of their legitimate jurisdiction, the abolition of religious orders in Poland, the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, all acts tending to the destruction of Catholicism in Russia. The Pope concludes by offering up a prayer that the Czar may put an end to the persecution of Catholics within the Russian dominions.

The Pope's allocution, on the subject of Rome and Italy, is a very remarkable manifesto, and produced a considerable sensation, particularly in France. The Paris journals comment at length on the document, the *Débats* observing: "The Holy Father at least cannot be reproached on account of want of clearness. He withdraws his benediction, which has been misunderstood, and he replaces it with a declaration of war."

The second allocution of Pius the Ninth, on the subject of the condition of the Catholic Church in Russia, is regarded as an ecclesiastical attempt to renew the Polish question, undertaken at the instance of France and Austria.

Simultaneously with the approaching termination of the temporal power, the opposition to the ecclesiastical despotism of the Pope is making remarkable progress in Italy. For several hundred years it has not occurred that a cardinal has gone so far in his opposition to the ecclesiastical authority claimed by the Pope, as recently has been done by Cardinal Andrea. The Cardinal has been suspended from the exercise of his functions as Bishop of Sabina, because he is a Liberal in politics. The Cardinal refuses to submit to this sentence of suspension, and in July, 1865, wrote a letter of appeal to the "Pope better informed." In this remarkable letter he reminds the Pope that all bishops are the brothers and equals (*confratelli*) of his Holiness. He tells him to remember the bishops are appointed, not by man, (that is, not by the grace of the Apostolic See,) but by the Holy Spirit, and that there is no ecclesiastical dignity more sublime or more independent than that of a bishop. He says plainly that all bishops are equal to the Pope, so far as order by divine institution goes, and that they are only inferior in jurisdiction according to the limits laid down by the Œcumenical

Councils. He further hints that he has not (as yet) been guilty of calling a national Synod to found a national Church, separated from the center of the Holy See, and he avows his conviction that the only means of settling existing difficulties is the convocation of an Œcumenical Council. If, as is likely, he is deprived of his Cardinalate for this bold speaking, it is almost certain that he will throw himself unreservedly into the arms of the reforming party, and in Jerome Cardinal D'Andrea, appointed Archbishop of Milan or of Naples, we may see the Cranmer of the Italian Church.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

INTRIGUES OF FRANCE FOR BRINGING ABOUT A UNION BETWEEN THE GREEK AND ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES.—A considerable sensation has recently been produced in all Europe by a report in the *Independance Belge*, stating that, through the agency of the French government, negotiations had been entered into with the Greek orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople to bring him to recognize, with all his co-religionists, the supremacy of the Church of Rome, and that the patriarch, together with other heads of the Greek Church in Turkey, had been gained over for the scheme, the conditions which he put having been found to be acceptable to the Pope. The rumor appears to have caused great emotion in Russia. The *Moscow Gazette* affirms that France took the initiative in these negotiations, conducted with the co-operation of the other Catholic powers, and it sees in them a direct menace to Russian influence in the East. It is, indeed, certain that the patronage of Russia over the Greek Christians would no longer have any meaning from the moment that the latter should enter the pale of Latin orthodoxy, and that the influence of that power would be in great measure destroyed. Subsequent reports from Turkey have denied the truth of the whole report, but it can hardly be doubted that French diplomacy has for years been busy in similar attempts, though it cannot be expected that they will meet with great success.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

AMONG the largest works which have been written against the new work of Rénan is one from Dr. Sepp, professor of history at the University of Munich. The author, a zealous Roman Catholic, is a man of great learning, but too credulous with regard to the legends sanctioned by the Church of Rome, to make his work of much use for Protestants. (Geschichte der Apostel, vom Tode *Jesu bis zur Zerstörung Jerusalems.* Schaffhausen. 1866.

A work from Christ. Hoffmann, entitled Progress and Decline, or History of the Apostacy, (*Fortschritt und Rückschritt.* Stuttgard, vol. 1, 1864. Vol. I, 1866,) treats of the growth of anti-christian sentiments. The work is well written, but from an extreme standpoint. The author is very severe upon the Church, to whose corruption and decay he ascribes the whole responsibility for the growth of infidelity. The second volume treats of the time from the accession of Frederick the Great to the French Revolution. Frederick is regarded as the agent who introduced the principles of infidelity from the private circles of scholars into the administration of states. The author denies that the French Revolution destroyed Christianity. The apostacy from Christianity had long preceded the revolution, and what the latter destroyed was only "the hypocrisy which serves God with external gestures, but omits to carry out his orders."

FRANCE.

M. Villemain has the merit to have, by his classic work, *Tableau de l'Eloquence Chrétienne au* IV*e siècle*, given a new impulse to the study of the Christian writers of the ancient Churches. If formerly they were almost exclusively read by theologians for polemic purposes, M. Villemain has shown by his work that many of them fully deserve to be studied for their lasting literary merit. France has of late furnished a

considerable number of able monographs on that period of the Christian Church. A new addition to this literature is a work by Fialon on St. Basil, one of the most prominent Fathers of the Greek Church, both as a writer and as bishop. (*Etude historique et literaire sur Saint Basile.* Paris, 1866.) This work is followed by a French translation of the Hexæmeron of St. Basil.

A similar work on Chrysostom has been published by Abbé Rochet. (*Histoire de Saint Jean Chrisostome, Patriarche de Constantinople.* 2 vols., Paris, 1866.)

A new work against the system of Positivism has been published by Ch. Pellarin, (*Essay Critique sur la Philosophie Positive.* Paris. 1866.) The work consists of a series of letters addressed to Mr. Littré. It is especially two points of this system which Mr. Pellarin combats: namely, that it altogether ignores the idea of God, and that it denies the idea of right. Mr. Pellarin, who is an ardent liberal, finds that it is a consequence of these two deficiencies that the system is silent on the great social questions.

Of the Roman Catholic bishops of France, none ranks so high as an influential writer on the great question of the day as Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans. Two new works from his pen on Education, each consisting of three large volumes, will therefore command general attention. The one treats of the Higher Education, (*De la Haute Education Intellectuelle.* Paris. 1866. Tome I, Belles Lettres; Tome II, History, Philosophy et Science; Tome III, Letters to Men of the World concerning the studies which are most appropriate for them.) The subject of the other work is Education in General. (*De l'Education.* Paris. 1866. 3 vols. Tome I, On Education; Tome II, On Authority and Respect in Education; Tome III, The Men of Education.)

Abbé Perreyre, Professor of Church Law at the Sarbonne, has issued a new apologetic work on the doctrines of the Church of Rome, (*Entretiens sur l'Eglise Catholique.* 2 vols. Paris. 1866.

A second volume has recently been published of the sermons of Eugene Bersier. (*Sermons.* Tome II. Paris. 1866.) Bersier has gained the reputation of being the greatest living pulpit orator of Protestant France.

Ed. de Pressensé's great work on the Life of Jesus, (*Jesus Christ, son Temps, sa Vie, son Œeuvre.* Paris. 1866,) has appeared in a second edition. The work has been translated into English, German, and Dutch. Against Rénan's work on the Apostles Pressensé has published an essay: *L'Ecole Critique et les Apostles.* Paris. 1866.

Pressensé (in the *Bulletin Theologique*) recommends a new work from L. Auguste Sabatier, on the Sources of the Life of Jesus, (*Essai sur les Sources de la Vie de Jesus.* Paris. 1866,) as a work of great merit, and of great promise for the future.

The influence of the theological literature of Germany upon France is great and increasing. The Tubingen School has able and zealous followers in Reville, who, besides a number of original works, is publishing numerous articles in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, and Stap, who explains the views of the school in the *Revue Germanique;* in Scherer, Colani, (Professor in Strasburg,) and partly in Reuss, (also Professor in Strasburg,) one of the most learned theologians in France. On the other hand the evangelical school of Germany begins likewise to educate in the Protestant Churches of France many disciples. Pressensé, the foremost among the evangelical theologians of France, whose works against Rénan have even elicited the praise and admiration of the Catholic bishops of France, has been educated at the German Universities, and both speaks and writes German well. Another young theologian of the same school, F. Bonifas, (who has just, by a majority of the Consistory, been elected over his Rationalistic competitor Professor of Theology at Montauban,) has published an able work on the "Unity of the apostolical Teaching," (*Essai sur l'Unite de l'Enseignement Apostolique.* Strasburg. 1866.) The work is dedicated to Professor Dorner. In its first part it gives a summary view of the doctrinal system of the Apostles James, Peter, Paul, and John, and of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the second part the work shows that the teachings of the apostles were entirely harmonious, both as regards the fundamental doctrines and the details.

RUSSIA.

One of the most important productions of the recent literature of the

Russian Church, the sermons of the Metropolitan of Moscow, the Archomandrite Philarete, has recently been translated into French in three thick volumes. We have here the teaching, dogmatical and political, of the most venerated representative of the Russian Church, and it is in exact accordance with all the works on theology which the professors of the Greek Orthodox Church have published of late years. The Anglican admirers of the Russian Church will find in these volumes, not in covert language, but in express terms, the doctrines of the real presence, the invocation of the saints, and of purgatory, at least if the practice of praying for the dead be, as logic points out, the belief in an intermediate state. The only difference that can be noted in the doctrine thus authoritatively taught from that of the Roman Church, is the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, which is not insisted on, and the denial of the papal supremacy in favor of the czar. This last is the only fundamental difference between the two Churches, but it is a difference of the widest description. The earth is the czar's, and the czar is the privileged interpreter of the will of God. What he wills, God commands. Liberty is the bane of mankind. It was by seeking liberty that Adam fell. Blessed, then, is the authority which points out where free action ends. The only real freedom is the slavery of duty. All other freedom is abusive. Thanks to the czar, holy Russia is the ante-room of heaven; and while all the neighboring states are mere sinks of iniquity, she is the protectress of legitimate power, order, and peace. If anarchy have not yet invaded the entire world, it is to her that it is due. (Vol. iii., p. 286.) The czar is not only the father of his family, the origin of all social life, he is the way of life. He who dies for the czar receives for his boon eternal life in the bosom of the Czar of czars.

Art. IX.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review, October, 1866. (New York.)—1. The Different Species of Sermons, and the Choice of a Text. 2. Jesus Christ and Criminal Law. 3. The Sandwich Islands Mission and its Calumniators. 4. The Athanasian Creed. 5. The Political Crisis. 6. Divine Revelation.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, October, 1866. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Preaching for the Times. 2. The Trinity in Redemption. 3. The Monophysite Churches of the East. 4. Forsyth's Life of Cicero. 5. The Missionary Enterprise, in its Bearing upon the Cause of Science and Learning. 6. Ecce Homo. 7. Dr. Williams's New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, October, 1866. (Gettysburg, Pa.)—1. The Dependence of the Church upon the Holy Spirit. 2. Credulity of Unbelief. 3. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. 4. Progress of the Gospel. 5. Samuel Johnson. 6. The Early History of Lutheranism in Illinois. 7. The Trinity. 8. The Conversion of Children.

New Englander, October, 1866. (New Haven.)—1. The Relations of Art to Education. 2. Contemporary England. A Review of Miss Martineau's History of England during the Peace. 3. The Political Preaching of Christ and his Apostles. A Review of Judge Black's Letter to Rev. Alfred Nevin, D. D., on "Political Preaching." 4. Mr. Mit-

chell's Novel, "Dr. Johns." 5. Dr. Hedge's Address to the Alumni of Harvard. 6. President Johnson's Tour, and his Policy.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1866. (Boston.)—23. Liberal Education—Its Objects and Claims. 24. Death in Adam, Life in Christ. 25. The Blind. 26. Gehenna. 27. The Church of the Moravian United Brethren. 28. The National and Ethical Bearings of the Mechanic Arts. 29. The Philosophy of Language. 30. Lecky's History of Rationalism. 31. The Skepticism of Humility.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1866. (Boston, Mass.)—1. The Origin of the Gospels. 2. The Ancestry and Education of the Orator Æschines. 3. Citations from the New Testament by the Apostolic Fathers. 4. Analysis and Synthesis both Necessary, in their Proportion, to True Reasoning. 5. The System of the Four Conjugations in Latin, a Classification of Ideas signified by their Characteristic Vowels. 6. Human Responsibility as related to Divine Agency in Conversion. 7. Professor Hermann Hupfeld. 8. Theories in Regard to the Nature of the Will. 9. The Topography of Jerusalem.

The articles on the origin of the Gospels, by Dr. Mombert, are timely at an hour when the flimsy criticisms of Rénan are flung upon the popular mind. They contain some new matter furnished from Tischendorf's investigations.

In the Codex Sinaiticus, lately discovered by Tischendorf, is a Greek copy of the Epistle of Barnabas, which was written about A. D. 107. Only a Latin copy existed before. This Latin version contains the following passage: Adtendamus ergo ne forte, *sicut scriptum est*, multi vocati, pauci electi inveniamur; "let us take care therefore lest we be found *as it is written*, many called, few chosen." Skeptics have questioned whether the phrase *as it is written*, the usual formula of Scripture quotation, is genuine. Tischendorf's Greek copy contains it; so that Matthew is therein quoted as canonical Scripture at the beginning of the second century.

Tischendorf also shows not only that the Gospels were translated into both Latin and Syriac about the middle of the second century, but, what is of striking importance, that these translations reveal the previous existence of a text-history; that is, a continued process of correcting and purifying the text of the Gospels by comparison and rejection, requiring an anterior period of fifty years, thus again carrying the existence of the Gospels back to the close of the first century. This fact demolishes the skeptical evasions, that quotations adduced from the Fathers, apparently from Matthew, may be really made not from Matthew, but from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It refutes, too, the notion (based upon a false interpretation of words of Papias) that Luke's Gospel originally appeared in a crude form.

English Reviews.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1866. (London.)—1. Maine de Biran. 2. Photography. 3. Notes on Waterloo. 4. The Moral View of the Atonement. 5. Jamaica. 6. Les Apôtres. By Rénan. 7. The New Germanic Empire.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Kaye's History of the Sepoy War. 2. Varieties of History and Art. 3. International Coinage. 4. Napoleon's Julius Cæsar. 5. Felix Holt, the Radical. 6. Strauss, Rénan, and "Ecce Homo." 7. Froude's Reign of Elizabeth. 8. Antique Gems. 9. The Military Growth of Prussia.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Ancient Literature of France. 2. Dr. Badham and the Dutch School of Criticism. 3. Homes without Hands. 4. Life of our Lord. 5. History of Architecture. 6. Central Asia. 7. Operations of Modern Warfare. 8. England and her Institutions.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1866. (London.)—1. Elizabeth of Denmark, Electress of Brandenburg. 2. Greek and Latin Hymnology. 3. Gallicanism. 4. The Three Tombs of Rome. 5. The Huguenot Refugees. 6. The Recent War in its Bearings on Popery and Protestantism. 7. Scottish Heresy Trials. 8. Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson, M.A.

The sixth article presents some striking points:

1. INCREASING SUPERIORITY OF THE EUROPEAN NORTH OVER THE SOUTH.—As a rule, if we keep off the Arctic zone, where the excessive cold stunts human development, the inhabitants of the north are in various respects superior to those of the south. They are so, above all, in military qualities. Not only are northern soldiers physically stronger than those of sunnier climes, but they are less elated in victory, and less depressed in defeat; and this equanimity strongly tends to give them the superiority in a protracted contest. It is not unworthy of note, that in the late continental war, the several combatants vanquished each other in the order of their proximity to the north. Prussia had the superiority over Austria, though the mountainous character of the latter country might have been supposed to counterbalance the slightly more northerly situation of Prussia. Again, Austria completely held its own against Italy, inasmuch as in this case the races of the north encountered one adapted to a more southerly clime. A Hindoo child can generally walk before a European infant of the same age can do more than creep; but at length the European will have the physical superiority. So, again, a Hindoo boy of twelve will, as a rule, stand higher in his class than a European of equal age; but by the time the two have reached eighteen or twenty, the European distances his competitor, and is not again overtaken at any future time. A spectacle in some respects analogous has been witnessed on the great theater of human history. In the infancy and youth of the world, the south had the predominance. The paramount power was successively held by Assyria and by Babylon, by Persia, by Greece, and by Rome, the north as yet having made slow progress toward civilization. But now that the world is beginning to approach its manhood, it is becoming increasingly apparent that its scepter will be swayed, not by southern, but by northern hands. The first are becoming last, and the last first.—P. 755.

2. THE THREE RACES.—If we except the nations immediately bordering on the Mediterranean, the three leading races of Europe have for a long time been the Teutonic, the Celtic, and the Sclavonic tribes. In using the first of these appellatives, for convenience' sake, it is needful to add, that its appropriateness is matter of dispute, the distinguished ethnologist Latham being of opinion that the Teutons, who, in conjunction with the Cimbri, so dreadfully defeated the Romans in the year B. C. 106, and some time later, were themselves

completely overthrown by Marius in two great battles, were really of the Celtic race. But whatever we may call them, whether Teutons, or Goths, or Germans, they constitute that well-known family of mankind, who, in one or other of their Scandinavian or German subdivisions, comprise the greater part of the population of England, Scotland, and the north of Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, Holland, Prussia, (with the exception of Posen,) Upper and Lower Austria, as well as the minor German states and German Switzerland. When the term Celtic is used in a widely generic sense, it is held to include not merely the well-known subdivisions of that race resident within the British isles, but also the French, with the inhabitants of the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland, and the majority of the Belgians. The third great race—the Sclavonic—comprises the Russians, the Poles, the Czechs of Bohemia, the Serbs, the Croats, the Lithuanians, and others.—Pp. 755, 756.

3. Teutonic Superiority, with a Brilliant Future.—The general course of human history has shown that the Teutonic nations are more capable of holding their own in the world than those of Celtic blood; for while the latter equal the former in bravery, and exceed them in rapidity of movement and in fierceness of assault, they fall short in endurance; and, successful at the commencement of a campaign, they are apt to give way in a protracted contest. In this, as in many other characteristics, they approximate to the nations of the south, and have been thought best adapted to countries beneath the 45° parallel of north latitude, while their rivals find their more appropriate place some degrees nearer the arctic circle. When Louis Napoleon sought to counteract the rapidly extending influence of the great Anglo-Saxon republic in America, by setting up a Mexican empire, he did so as the patron of what he called "the Latin race." His meaning, probably, was, either that the Italians, the Spaniards, the Portuguese, and the French, were originally very much akin, or that they had been fused into one nearly homogeneous people by Roman conquest. On either hypothesis, the statements already made seem borne out. Whether the semi-Celtic French were from the first marked, as we believe, by southern characteristics, or whether these were imparted to them during the domination of imperial Rome, in either case it places them on an inferior pedestal to that occupied by the Teutonic tribes, which held their own against Rome at the proudest period of its history; and, when it became degenerate, broke in upon its realm, and snatched the sceptre from its hands. Hence ethnographers seem as one in anticipating a brilliant future for the Teutonic tribes. The views entertained in regard to this subject by Dr. Gustav Kombst, which may be seen in the notes to his ethnographic map of Europe, are so extreme as to make him for the moment forget Christianity, international obligation, and even ordinary humanity. Pritchard and Latham, on the contrary, speak with scientific caution; but still the former considers the Teutonic tribes as superior to the Celtic; and the latter, in dry scientific formula, terms the Celtic area "receding," and that of the Teutons "pre-eminently encroaching."—Pp. 756, 757.

4. Present Comparative Number of the Three Races in Europe.—Kombst, writing in 1843, estimated the populations of Teutonic blood, pure and mixed, in Europe at 82,700,000; the Celtic at 68,000,000; and the Sclavonic at 58,000,000. Or, omitting the British isles, we may say that there were in 1843 about 62,700,000 Teutons, 58,000,000 of Celts, and the same number of Sclavonians throughout the European continent. If, when the Teutons attempt to reunite, either of the rival races interfere by force of arms, to prevent the union, it will probably fail; but the two rivals making common cause might be successful in their endeavor.—P. 758.

5. Comparative Increase of Populations.—The different races or nationalities are increasing at very different rates, so much so that their relative importance will be greatly altered in a hundred years from what we find it at present. If France increase as slowly as it has done of late, its voice in the affairs of Europe and the world will be less and less potent with the lapse of time. In 1826, the sum total of population in France was 31,851,545; in 1855 it was 35,781,628. There had therefore been in twenty-eight years an increase of 3,930,083, that is, an annual addition of 140,360. . . . The British increase is more than two and a half times that of France. . . . Prussia has thrice the

proportion of the increase on the population of France, and nearly double the proportion of that of Great Britain (as kept down by emigration.) . . . Even apart from any temporary superiority of weapons on the Prussian side, and not taking into account the probability that the southern German states will speedily begin to gravitate to the northern nationality, the rapid increase of population in the newly extended kingdom will ultimately put it beyond the power of France taken alone, or even aided by Belgium, to forbid its development.—Pp. 764–766.

6. PROTESTANTISM COULD NOW CONQUER CATHOLICISM IN WAR.—The transfer of the power of Germany from Papal to Protestant hands now so much casts the balance against Rome, that if all the Papal powers of Europe were now to combine, they could not bring so-called heresy into serious danger. Several times in the world's history they have succeeded in doing so, and in 1851, during the period of reaction which succeeded the revolutionary outbreaks of 1848, the great Romish organ, the Paris *Univers*, if it were not misquoted in this country, commended executions for heresy, and sanguinary wars against its professors, and threatened a new crusade. Its hope, doubtless, was in a combination of the Romish powers. . . . Now the period for a combination of the Romish powers against Britain seems past; for Britain and Prussia together could vanquish all Papal Europe. Add the states of America; and Protestantism could now defeat Popery throughout the world, either in a military or in a naval struggle. There can no longer be any dispute that the scepter of the world has passed from Papal into Protestant hands. But if we advert to what has already been stated in regard to the relative increase of the several races of Europe, it will be evident that the present predominance of Protestantism will yearly advance. 1866, then, which it is remarkable that the great majority of Protestant interpreters had long fixed on as one fraught with destiny to the Papacy, will be memorable in the annals of that false faith, and of the world.—Pp. 772, 773.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1866. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Irish Church. 2. The Apostles. By Ernest Rénan. 3. The English and their Origin. 4. The Abbé Lamennais on Dante. 5. The Canadian Confederation and the Reciprocity Treaty. 6. The Dog: His Intelligence. 7. Our North Pacific Colonies. 8. The Forest of Fontainebleau.

The second article is a specimen of the broadest, vulgarest Tom-Paineism, sharply berating Rénan for his over faith in the gospel history, and his attempting to fill up with his putty and paint the crevices of those very narratives whose falsity he has antecedently demonstrated. Rénan is convicted of the folly and falsehood of undertaking to construct history out of utterly unhistorical data, so that his history is necessarily nothing more than fiction idealized into system.

The truthfulness of the reviewer is illustrated by the following passage.

For the sons of Zebedee, as for the Psalmist of an age long past, the earth was a flat plane of very moderate compass, with a solid heaven separating the waters above the firmament from the waters beneath it, while in this concave vault of crystal the sun and moon moved from one side to the other, and in it the stars were fixed like jewels on the diadem of a king. . . . On the solid heaven sat the Great Lord of all, and bowing his throne touched the mountains and made them smoke.—P. 151.

This is in keeping with the coarse, old-fashioned infidelity, before the art was learned, so skillfully practiced by the politer skepticism

of the present day, of eulogizing Jesus to death as Judas kissed him unto death. We used to see a picture of "Jehovah the Jewish idol," made up of an engraved combination of all the anthropomorphic phrases found in Hebrew poetry, forming of course an image as incongruous as the monster with which Horace opens his *De arte poetica*. Yet the man wants sense or candor who will deny that the maintenance of a pure spiritual supreme monotheism was the conscious mission of the Old Testament. "In the beginning God," is its very first announcement; God the creator of the heavens and the earth. This God had no form, but was symbolized to Israel by the cloudy, fiery pillar. No similitude of him appeared at Mount Sinai, and so the decalogue forbids all shaping of images. No shape appeared upon the ark of the covenant in the most holy. When the temple was built God's presence appeared only in luminous clouds; Solomon declared that "the heaven of heavens could not contain" him; and when Pompey, after conquering Jerusalem, went behind the vail to examine the statuary, he found with amazement—nothing. How far absolute metaphysical immensity of space and absolute divine omnipresence was distinctly conceived by the ancient mind, is not the present question. Just so far at any rate as a universe was conceived, a spiritual deity was conceived, amply competent to embrace, pervade, and control it. Such was the literal theologic and philosophic view taken by the Old Testament mind; and yet in full consistency with this it freely dealt with anthropomorphic phrases and conceptions, just as the most ideal of Berkleyan philosophers, who deny all external existences, have no difficulty of talking as staidly about "hard matter," and "solid granite" as the most dogmatical realist.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, October, 1866. (London.)—1. Alternative Versions of the Psalms. 2. Hermes Trismegistus. 3. The Abuse of Criticism in Religion. 4. Dr. Rowland Williams and the Prophets. 5. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. 6. Pantheism. 7. Limitation of Inspiration. 8. The True Character of Mary of Magdala. 9. Church of the Holy Sepulchre. 10. Eusebius of Cæsarea on the Star. 11. Obituary—J. M. Neale, D.D.

This number contains a sarcastic notice of a publication by Dr. Rigg, a leading Wesleyan writer, entitled *Essays for the Times on Ecclesiastical Subjects*. Dr. Rigg in his book puts a very special veto upon all expectations that the Wesleyans are to come under the covert of the archbishop's gown by any ecclesiastical reunion. The notice of the journal is worthless enough. Its only significance is, that it furnishes some hope that the English Methodists will

decline hanging on to the skirts of the oligarchy, both secular and hierarchical, and feel the higher dignity of going to the heart of the people. We have had no opportunity of ocular inspection. But to our mind's eye it would be a glorious day for English Methodism if she would rise to the fullness of her ancient mission, abjure all her coquetries with the high respectabilities, and intrust her destinies with the manhood and the masses. The first outward business is the overthrow of the suffrage monopoly, her second the abolishment of the adultery between Church and State, the overthrow of an oppressive hierarchy. These are parts of her great mission, as imitators of the meek and lowly Jesus, as followers in the footsteps of Wesley, to bring a glad evangel to the lowly. Blessed will be the time when she shall so see and do. In our great struggle with the American oligarchy her noblest spirits, to their honor be it proclaimed, were on our side; in her great struggle against her nation's oligarchy we should be grandly on her side.

French Reviews.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*August* 1.—2. E. DE LAVELEYE, Popular Instruction in the Nineteenth Century, (fourth article: Secular Schools and Primary Instruction in Holland.) 6. COCHUT, Nationalities, with Special Regard to the War in 1866.

August 15.—2. LITTRE, The Positive Philosophy. Auguste Comte and J. Stuart Mill. 4. ETIENNE, Contemporaneous Criticism in England, (second article: David Masson.)

September 1.—2. JANET, The Liberty of Thinking. 4. C. DE MAZADE, Venice since 1848, and Italy. 5. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Cuba. 7. GREGORI, War, Electric Telegraphs, and Railroads.

September 15.—1. DUCHESNE DE BELLECOURT, The War of Paraguay and the Institutions of the La Plata States. 3. O. D'HAUSSONVILLE, The Roman Church and the Negotiations concerning the Concordat. 6. KERATRY, Mexico, and the Chances of the New Empire. 8. H. DE SYBIL, Prussia and New Germany.

October 1.—4. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Cuba (second article.) 5. AUBERTIN, Michelet's History of Louis XV.

October 15.—2. ESQUIROS, England and English Life, (thirty-first article.) 3. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, Cuba, (third article.) 4. E. DU HAILLY, The French Colony in Cochin China. 5. TAILLANDIER, New Germany. 6. RECLUS, The South American Republics and their Project of Federation.

Mr. Littré, a member of the *Institut*, is by far the most prominent of the followers of Auguste Comte, and has therefore thought it to be his duty of replying to the powerful objections made to the system of Comte by Stuart Mill. (*Auguste Comte and Positivism*, London, 1865. A reprint from the *Westminster Review*.) Mill

admires some portions of the system of Comte, but the latter he thinks has no claim to being the founder of a positive philosophy, but only to having made to it some valuable contributions. Littré in his turn objects to Mill that he fails to point out the connection and hierarchy of the parts of positive philosophy, and that herein lies the great merit of Comte. Littré reaffirms his belief in the truth of the positive philosophy and its great mission. With Comte and Mill, he believes that "a creed which has gained the cultivated minds of a society is sure sooner or later, unless crushed by force, to reach the mass of the people," and this consideration consoles him about the little progress which the system has thus far made.

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, with special reference to the Theories of Rénan, Strauss, and the Tubingen School. By Rev. Geo. P. Fisher, M.A., Professor of Church History in Yale College. 12mo., pp. 586. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co.

The vitality of our Christian faith, and its alertness at self-defense, are strikingly evinced in the fact that the bold assaults of Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur on the genuineness of the early Christian records became first broadly known to our American Church by repeated trenchant refutations. Professor Fisher is obliged fairly and fully to set up his man before he bowls him down. Yet his is no supererogatory performance. The work of Baur has furnished largely the staple of the infidelity poured upon the British and American public through the pages of the Westminster Review. And while our American thinkers are constantly hearing the booming echoes of the profound skepticism of Germany, it is well that the indefinite monster should be fully exhibited, and his real dimensions placed before our eyes. "Omne ignotum pro magnifico," saith Tacitus; danger unknown passeth for infinite. Let the fiery-flying serpent be fairly caught by the tail between the fingers, and he may prove but a pitiful lightning-bug.

Professor Fisher exhibits perfect mastery of the literature of his subject. He writes in a style of classic purity, with great clearness of both thought and expression, tending rather to a fluid diffuseness than to a compact demonstrative force. He excels, perhaps, more in lucid exposition than in severe logic. We often feel the need of an embracement of a whole argument in some concise

portable summary, a whole in a pocketable nutshell. But the entire work is one of the noblest, most readable, most timely and effective contributions to our apologetic literature which has appeared at the present day.

Near two hundred pages are first devoted to a review of the origin of the four Gospels, in the light of the "latest criticism." Near two hundred pages more perform the work for Baur upon the Acts of the Apostles and the apostolic history. One hundred further pages deal exemplary damage upon Strauss's myths and mythicisms, including that unhappy man's latest restatement of himself; with near a hundred pages of addendum upon the less scientific performances of Rénan and Theodore Parker. The seventy concluding pages discuss the abstract question, historical and metaphysical, of the possibility and reality of miracles, and the divine personality as opposed to positivism and pantheism. These great topics, possessing an absorbing interest at the present hour, pregnant with the history of the future, are discussed with an affluence of learning and a power of thought well worthy the attention of the large body of our readers whose minds are awake to the progress of religious opinion.

The parts devoted to Strauss, his mythicism and his restatement, strike us as eminently destructive upon the destroyer. Strauss figures as poorly in Professor Fisher's hands as Paulus does in the hands of Strauss. The possibility of the formation of myths is contradicted by the brevity of the allowable time, by the explicitness of the existing testimony, by the authenticity of the Gospel and apostolic documents, by the rationalistic, Sadducaic, historical character of the gospel age. Strauss has collected a large amount of textual difficulties in detail; his book is an arsenal of sceptical weapons; but as a system and a solution his theory must fall.

The Church at Jerusalem who had perhaps seen Jesus, and to whom the apostles preached, according to Professor Baur, (and the old Socinians,) was *Ebionite.* That is, it held to the mere humanity of Christ, to the community of goods and the merit of poverty, and to the permanent retention in the Church of the Mosaic law and ritual. This was the simple primitive Christianity of Jesus and Peter. When the destruction of Jerusalem approached, this Jerusalem Church took refuge in Pella and the Jordanic regions. When Gentiles made influx into the Church, the universal Christian body became divided into two great hostile camps, with Peter and Paul as their respective heads; the party, namely, of primitive conservatives, who maintained the continuance of circumcision with all of old Mosaicism; and the party of the progressives, who went

for emancipation from the old yoke, and an enlargement into a broad universal spiritual Christianity. These two parties fought with all the political rancor of Tammany and Mozart. Of the Ebionite, or primitive Christian party, Baur maintains that the Clementine documents form the best existing hand-book. There we have the real essence of the actual religiosity of Jesus and his immediate hearers and attendants. Four Epistles of Paul are genuine, and are mere party documents flung out in the heat of the strife, and are the best monuments now extant of the conflict. Late in the second century a compromise was attempted, and the romance incorporated into our canon, entitled "The Acts of the Apostles," was published to aid in this compromise. This aid was furnished by a fancy history, in which Peter and Paul and their respective parties are described as fraternizing most amicably, and are both pictured as brother heroes—heroes in establishing terms of compromise in their own day, and so authorizing compromise for all the future. Such is the scheme of the great leader of the celebrated "Tubingen divines." Strauss had dealt in destructive criticism upon the Gospels; this is the completion of the process, covering the apostolic history.

Straus sendeavors to answer the question: On the assumption that there is no supernatural, how can the Gospel history be explained? Baur answers the same question in regard to the Acts and the Epistles. Both together assume to explain how Christianity came into existence without any truly miraculous element. Against Baur Prof. Fisher masses a large body of argument showing the absolute arbitrary nature of the whole process, and maintaining the authenticity of the book of Acts and the impugned Epistles of Paul. Thus the whole process and set of processes presented to the world by Strauss, Rénan, and Baur, are prompted by and presuppose one great AXIOM—an axiom which they scorn to prove, as being of course a first principle which nothing but an unnoticeable idiocy would question. That axiom is, that *the order of nature is never interrupted.* This maxim does not merely affirm that the laws of nature are intrinsically immutable; that is, that they contain in themselves no proviso for their own mutation; for all that is true and undenied. It goes further, and assumes to say that there is no power over and above the normal order, that can interpose an interruption to its process. It is to the consideration of these presuppositions that Professor Fisher devotes the closing part of his volume.

Professor Fisher concedes a validity to the Paleyan argument for theism, drawn from visible design in creation, yet affirms its deficien-

cies with the incautiousness and injustice to Paley, as we think, at the present day fashionable but not wise. "To identify omnipotence with exceeding great power, *as Paley does*, is to reason loosely and abandon the proper conception of God." Now, according to our recollections, Paley does neither identify great power with metaphysical omnipotence, nor claim that his argument demonstrates the metaphysical omnipotence of God. He only claims to have demonstrated a practical working conclusion of God amply adequate as a religious basis for all moral purpose. If the universe be, as Professor Fisher says, a finite product, Paley's Deity is its supreme and absolute master. That Deity is as omnipotent as the Deity of our Holy Bible. That Deity is an ample deity for miracle, revelation, and religion. All over and above this is necessary not for religious assurance—the object for which as a defender of revelation the professor is writing—but for the mere demands of metaphysical thought. The astronomer affirms the law of gravitation to be coextensive with the phenomenal universe; and if the metaphysician pleases to question whether it extends through the empty immensity with which the universe is surrounded, he rightfully declines the discussion; and so may the theologian decline a similar challenge with regard to the divine omnipotence. The astronomer's gravitation is ample for natural philosophy; the Paleyan omnipotence is ample enough for natural theology. If the Christian philosopher accept the metaphysical challenge let it not be as a defender of his faith, but simply an athlete upon the metaphysical palestra. *Paley's deity governs the universe;* and Paley can afford to leave the metaphysicians to discuss about the desert immensity outside the universe. If metaphysical thought affirms the reign of an Absolute through an absolute immensity, then Paley can accept that absolute as identical with his deity, provided that the attributes his argument has proved as belonging to God be not impugned. Metaphysical thought must yield to and harmonize with conclusions based upon fair inductions drawn from experiential facts.

Jesus Christ: his Times, Life, and Work. By E. De Pressense. 8vo., pp. 560. London: Jackson, Walford, & Hodder.

The author of this work, De Pressensé, the editor of the Revue Chretienne, is perhaps the most distinguished leader of French Evangelical Protestantism, and was perhaps the most suitable man living to furnish a counteraction to Renan's romance of Jesus. He is scarce Rénan's inferior in brilliancy of style, is more than

his equal in a true sympathy and perfect mastery of his subject, and, like Rénan, has traversed the Holy Land, not, according to the vain boast of Rénan to furnish a fifth and fancy Gospel, but to acquire a true appreciation of the existing four. The work is formally controversial in but a subordinate degree; its main purpose being *positive*, namely, to set forth the true image of Jesus from the data furnished by the evangelical records. It is a timely and a masterly performance, written with freshness and power; and inasmuch as, according to Pressensé's statement, Renan's book "has given us an impetus to thought, and fired the public mind with an enthusiasm for questions which twenty years ago would assuredly have been pronounced superannuated," we cannot but hope that the present work will be an efficient providential instrument in attaining the triumph of a pure Christianity in France.

The work is divisible into two parts. The first part is a dissertation preliminary to the great biography, and the second is the biography itself. The preliminary consists first of three chapters upon the credibility of the supernatural, affording perhaps no great new thought, but written with great freshness and life. A statement of this part of the subject impressive to the feelings is indeed legitimate and suitable; for the mental state which rejects the supernatural is rather a temper and feeling than a logical position. The proposition that *there is no supernatural*, or that *no miraculous manifestations ever took place*, never has been and never can be proved but by the assumption of itself. It is primarily a piece of bold conjectural negative *faith;* as bold a *faith* as any dogma of Christian theology requires; and bolder too, since it stands in contradiction to that primary presentiment of our highest nature, which through all the history of our race has affirmed the reality of the supernatural, and has demanded that manifestations of the divine should take place upon earth. To our highest nature miracles, in their proper place and order, are antecedently probable. Our author then traces with a vivid pencil the anterior history of Judaism subsequent to the close of the Old Testament, in its relations to Paganism and to the future Christianity. Nowhere have we seen this subject invested with so vivid an interest. Its purpose in our author's hands is to disprove the merely human development of Christianity from the course of antecedent human thought, and to show its divine originality, both in its doctrines and in the unparalleled character of Christ's own person. With a review, then, of the origin and evidences of the four Gospels, refuting the criticism and logic of Rénan, the first part of the work closes.

The narrative of the Lord's life, which forms the second part, is purely the combination of the Gospel accounts, standing in the light of contemporary history, defended against the cavils of skepticism, and illustrated with philosophic thought and beauty of style. Some concessions there are to the spirit of skepticism, unnecessary acknowledgements of minor mistakes on the part of the Gospel writers, wrung from him doubtless in the heat of the battle, but quite unacceptable to the calm firm faith of the American evangelical Church. Upon these we need not be severe, but rather sustain and back this noble champion of the gospel with indulgent allowance for the difficulties of his arduous position. An American edition of the work, with some revisions of the translation, and a few cautionary notes, could not fail, we think, of producing a beneficial effect.

It is a point much pressed by Strauss, and other skeptical writers, that it is incredible that the raising of Lazarus, if actual, should have been left unnoticed by three of the Evangelists. To what is said by Pressensé (as well as what we have said in our commentary upon the passage) let us suggest a further thought. Neither of the three Evangelists besides John was probably present; and probably they were either unaware of the fact, or at any rate of its importance in hastening the catastrophe. Mark and Luke were of course absent. And Jesus has just emerged from the Peræan history furnished by Luke alone, which, bearing the most striking traits of authenticity, was not the result of the Evangelist's personal eye-sight, but consists apparently of documentary matter. From the whole of that Peræan history Matthew, since he omits the whole, may have been absent, and coming from Galilee after the resurrection of Lazarus, may have joined the company of Jesus at the Passover. What wonder, therefore, that John, the sole Evangelist present, should have been the sole narrator of the event?

Both the beautiful style and the reverent spirit of De Pressensé are exhibited in the following passages, being the closing two paragraphs of his work:

> At the close of this long contemplation of the Divine model on which I have been gazing, in the earnest endeavour to reproduce some of its features, I feel overwhelmed with the sense of my powerlessness. "I would fain, O Divine Son of Mary," to use the words of one of thy noblest confessors, "feeble as I am, have said something great of thee." At times I have seemed, in the brief illumination of some blessed hour, to see thee in thy Divine Majesty—thy brow radiant with love and grief, and crowned with that spotless purity which has terrors only for the proud, because it is inseparable from thy sovereign love. I have seemed to see thee on the shore of the lake thou lovedst, or in the villages of Galilee, in the midst of that retinue of the afflicted and despised, who formed

thy guard of honor in thy royal progress of mercy! But when I have sought to fix the holy vision, the pencil has trembled in my unskillful hands, and I have only been able to give a dim outline of that which had bowed me in the dust in adoration before thee. What are we, to describe thy holiness?

The distance is too great from us to thee! How can we, from the lowness of our common lives, rise to the inspiration of that life which was consumed by one single thought of love, and which, from its commencement to its close, was one offering to God and man! Plunged in petty vanities and mean ambition, how can we comprehend thine utter scorn for human glory, O King crowned with thorns! Upon us falls that word spoken in thy just indignation: "Ye are from beneath, I am from above." Therefore it is, that for this very work itself I crave thy forgiveness. My hope, my consolation, is that thou wilt surely disperse the clouds with which, in ignorance or weakness, I may have darkened thine adorable countenance, and manifest thyself plainly to the willing heart in which I may have awakened a desire to know thee better.

Ecce Homo: a Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ. 12mo., pp. 355. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866.

Ecce Homo! Ἴδε ὁ ἄνθρωπος! Not as in our English version, *Behold the Man*, (John xix, 5,) as a mere *object* of our gaze, but, *Lo the Man*, standing forth as a living power in the world to awaken our wonder. And in few works in this age of Christologies does the divine man stand out with so striking a delineation as the volume we now notice. We say this in full view of the fact that leading evangelical divines have delivered the most pronounced condemnation upon the work. This condemnation arises, we think, from a mistaken view of the author's real purpose. If the work should be read as a standard of a true evangelical theology, the condemnation is just; but if it be read as a reply to Strauss and Rénan, demonstrating, by a somewhat new and original method, that their Jesus-picture is a pitiful failure, it will be found, we think, an invaluable and indestructible addition to our body of Christian defenses.

For this mistake of many critics as to the object of the work, the author himself is greatly responsible. In the first place, he has scattered through his work a number of very unnecessary as well as very calumnious slurs upon the most earnest class of the professors of the religion he is defending. And, second, he hangs out a false guide-board in his very preface, announcing that his object is to depict a fresh study of Jesus for "those" (mark the pet phraseology of our small dabblers in pantheism) "who feel dissatisfied with the current conceptions of Christ." Nor is it until his fifty-second page that it occurs to him to tell us that "the present treatise aims to show that the Christ of the Gospels is not mythical, by showing that the character those biographers portrayed is in all its large features strikingly consistent, and at the same time

so peculiar as to be altogether beyond the reach of invention both by individual genius and still more by what is called the "consciousness of an age." Now, in our own view, this work he has accomplished in a manner most conclusive against the criticisms of Strauss and the romancings of Rénan. He demonstrates the existence of a reality underlying the inartistic Gospel narrations, so consistent and so sublime, that the conceptions of Rénan as representations of Jesus crisp into worthlessness in the comparison. The sound-minded thinker who has, for the time being, been seduced into the imagination that the poetizing Frenchman has presented a true Jesus, is very likely to be wisely ashamed of himself. Such a reader may, indeed, not feel that the exegetical criticisms of Strauss are answered in detail; that belongs to another department of investigation; but he is satisfied that, whatever becomes of the verbal text, the divine man whom it describes, with however imperfect a phrase, is real and is divine. Take for instance the history of the temptation. It is narrated by the Gospel writers in the plainest, most prosaic and fragmentary style imaginable; without the slightest tinge of ideality. Of ideality, indeed, the writers seem incapable. But through the dim and blurred glass of their homely text look keenly, and you will descry an *idea* grander than those men, grander than that age, grander than any age, has ever produced in its kind. The apologue of the Vision of Hercules is the nearest approach which classic antiquity could furnish. But compare the two in all their dimensions and qualities, and how infinitely inferior is the latter! When, who, and what was the genius that furnished the divine conception? With a masterly hand does our author trace in a similar way the great conceptions of the kingdom of God, its King, and its Law, delineated in the Gospels, and shows how infinitely the work is superior to the genius of the workmen. All this is done in a style of criticism which, though it may fail in occasional details, is marked with profoundest insight, with most delicate discrimination, and most self-evidencing conclusiveness. The diction is clear, incisive, eloquent. The march of the argument, though much may be left in suggestive incompleteness, is onward and right onward. There are paragraphs, and pages, and chapters consisting of sayings hitherto unsaid and thinkings hitherto unthought.

Of course such an argument cannot be considered new in the sense that no germ or seed has hitherto existed of its nature. There is a paragraph by Rousseau, in which the vivid mental eye of that philosopher catches a most clear sight of the self-evidencing majesty of the Lord's person, and portrays it with an exquisite pen-

cil. The superiority, out of all comparison, of the Son of Mary over the son of Sophroniscus, (Socrates,) is asserted in words of light. *The construction of such a character by the four Evangelists were a greater miracle than any ascribed to Jesus.* This last is what Rousseau asserts, and what our author at full length demonstrates; and the demonstration, we say, is so complete, it so brings the one great personal miracle right before our eyes, that the appreciative reader can well afford to fling in the concession, as boot, of all the other miracles.

The History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By Henry Hart Milman, Dean of St. Paul's. Three volumes, pp. 485, 478, 507. Riverside Edition. New York: W. J. Widdleton. 1866.

It is near thirty years since the accomplished Dean Milman first published this Church history, preceded by its learned and able life of Jesus. Dr. Strauss had published his life of Jesus sufficiently earlier for Milman to read and append to his life a brief reply. The thirty years have passed; both writers reappear; and in what style? Dr. S. appears with a reconstructed book, with admission of failure of effect in the first, and with a sad loss of temper at the loss of his labor and his argument. Dean Milman reappears with all the unruffled equanimity of an elegant Churchman, to tell us that thirty years have furnished no call for any material alteration in his great work. Milman furnishes a new preface, in which he characterizes Strauss, Rénan, and the Tübingen gentry with a few masterly strokes. He has adorned his margin with a few more notes; but as for the work itself, it stands essentially untouched, with a sameness that would greatly irk us did we not well remember how brilliant the work in its sameness is, and had not Widdleton given it a resurrection with a far more beautiful body than it wore when it came, years since, from the Harper press.

Milman characterizes Rénan's book in the following terms:

> Another work has now appeared, since the present edition was printed off, more brilliant and popular, in a language of universal currency, and in a style in which that language displays itself in all its captivating force, life, and distinctness. Yet I cannot but think this very perfection of style in some degree fatal to its pretensions. There are passages in which the vivid transparency betrays at once the perplexity of the writer, and the inconceivable feebleness of his arguments. I cannot apprehend more lasting effect from the light, quick, and bright flashing artillery of the Frenchman, than from the more ponderous and steadily aimed culverins of the German. In one respect I had expected more from the wide and copious erudition of M. Rénan. But I find no illustration, no allusion from the Jewish writers, which was not familiar to me from Lightfoot, Schœtgen, Meuschen,

and the great Talmudic scholars of the last two centuries. I suspect that they have exhausted the subject. As little new can be found or could be expected from the scenery and topography of Palestine, in like manner drained to the utmost by so many travelers before M. Rénan. Even as to the style—may an Englishman venture to contrast it (by no means in its favor) not only with the dignity and solemnity of Pascal, but with the passionate earnestness of Rousseau —its "thin sentimentality" (this is not my own expression) reminds me more of "Paul et Virginie" than, I will not say of the "Pensees," but even of the "Vicaire Savoyard." I cannot think that eventually the book will add to the high fame of M. Rénan. To those who see in Christianity no more than a social revolution, a natural step in human progress, the beautiful passages on the transcendant humanity of Jesus (unhappily not unleavened) may give satisfaction and delight: to those to whom Christiany is a *religion*, Jesus the author and giver of eternal life, it will fall dead, or be a grief and an offense.

Of the elaborate abortions of Tübingen, Milman thus speaks:

It seems to me that instead of the theory being the result of diligent and acute investigation, the theory is first made, and then the inferences or arguments sought out, discerned, or imagined, and wrought up with infinite skill, to establish the foregone conclusion; at the same time with a contemptuous disregard, or utter obtuseness to the difficulties of their own system. Their criticism will rarely bear criticism.

The erudition, the eloquence, the judicial impartiality, the clear-sightedness which judges of ancient events and character in the light of modern thought, yet with just apprehension of the difference of ages, render Milman's history a work of rare value. The life of Jesus, with which it commences, was the first attempt in the English language to exhibit the Saviour divested of that conventional haze which ever seemed to render it an inreality. Its value is still unimpaired, and it is well worthy a separate publication. The thoughtful reader will find Church history in Milman's hands full of varied life. His chapters on Julian, on the great prelates, and on Jerome, are especially attractive.

Widdleton is publisher of the works formerly produced by Redfield of New York and Veazie of Boston, and of the issues of the Riverside press; works of standard value in the highest style of the art.

Christ, and other Masters: An Historical Inquiry into some of the Chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World. With special Reference to Prevailing Difficulties and Objections. By CHARLES HARDWICK, M. A., Late Archdeacon of Ely, and Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. Two volumes, pp. 383, 461. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1863. On sale by Scribner.

Mr. Hardwick was a scholar of rare erudition, talent, and industry. He was born in 1821, and finished his brief laborious career in 1860. Among his many productions were a History of the Articles of Religion, (republished in this country,) two volumes of Church history, and these two volumes under our notice.

The present work is divided into four parts. The first part, after reviewing those tendencies of the age that demand a general survey of the theologies of the world, traces the characteristics of the central figure, the true religion of the Old Testament and the New. Part second presents a most complete view of the religions of India. Part third presents an equally excellent summary of the religions of China, America, and Oceanica. Part fourth exhibits those of Egypt and Medo-Persia. We have thus before us mapped out a clear comprehensive view, historical and analytical, of those great stupendous systems of religious thought held in different parts of the world by the human race. The whole is brought down to the latest dates, exhibiting the best results of the most modern scholarship to the hour of publication. All these systems are exhibited not only as they are and were in themselves, but also in relation to and in comparison with Christianity. The questions most interesting to the inquisitive thinker are boldly propounded, and thoroughly, yet most candidly, discussed in the light of the latest information. The death of the author left it in some respects an unfinished work. Another part, argumentative in its character, he intended to furnish, in which he purposed to "discuss these religions as one great whole, and to determine the place of the present argument among our Christian defenses and evidences; and to analyze more minutely the causes which have rendered heathen systems so ineffective, and which led in so many instances to their rapid deterioration." The providential failure of the author to furnish this *finale* is a matter of just regret. But there still is a round completeness in the work as it stands. The entire view of the religions of the world is before us, and a work of no little value it is.

It is a work not merely to be *read* but *studied*. It should be reread, mastered, and concocted into settled and primary knowledge. It ought to be republished under the heading of Comparative Theology, and form a part of the course, if not of our theological institutes, certainly of every theological student.

Under the heading of Egypt, for instance, we have a very valuable discussion of the question—so vital to the validity of the Old Testament theology—how much did Moses borrow from Egypt, and what the conclusions? In another part comes up the question: How much did the Jews appropriate into their religion from Persia and Babylon; and how far is it true that the Messiah is a Persian idea, and the New Testament a plagiary from Persism? How far is it clear that Monotheism was the primitive idea of the race, how far exclusively maintained by the Hebrew Church, how

far shared by the Oriental systems? What is the validity, the excellence, the origin of the various great religions? How far may they be considered, as Mr. Maurice views them, as so many sublime efiorts of men, under inspiration of the Logos, to attain and systematize divine truth? How far is there an absolute religion, held catholically in central grasp by all the thoughtful world? To these and many other cognate questions, in which deep interests are involved, and around which so much skepticism hovers, every thoughtful Christian desiderates an answer. Nowhere in our language can be found the answers so clearly, comprehensively, boldly, and compactly given as in this work of Mr. Hardwick's.

Orthodoxy: its Truths and Errors. By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. 12mo., pp. 512. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1866.

Dr. Clarke's Unitarianism is not of the most ultra stamp. He is no blank deist or blanker pantheist. There is something of the gospel in his theology, something of the Christ in his religion. He believes in the Bible, with allowances; in a trinity of threefold manifestations; in a Christ who is more than man; in a supernatural which is only a natural in the great whole; in an atonement coming under the genus vicarious; in possible instantaneous conversion and regeneration; in a future punishment which is not eternal. On all these points orthodoxy is almost right, but *never* quite right, as Dr. Clarke *always* is. However orthodoxy draws her line, whether strait or curve, Dr. Clarke at due distance draws a strait or curve, ever parallel, never coinciding. And as Dr. Clarke is just *right*, there can be no coinciding unless orthodoxy comes right by coming to him. And yet such coinciding, we soberly think, is of much less consequence to orthodoxy than to Dr. Clarke.

Dr. Clarke in his first chapter considers orthodoxy in its various lights; as signifying the "oldest doctrine," as "the doctrine of the majority," as "right opinion," etc. But there is one light in which we regret that he wholly omits to view it: namely, as *the necessary condition to the existence of heterodoxy.* When a king once threatened his soothsayer with death the latter responded: "Slay me, O king, but know that the stars declare that you are to survive me but a single day." When Dr. Clarke has slain the mighty life of orthodoxy, how long does he suppose his paltering half-and-half heterodoxy will stand the battle brunt of rampant infidelity? In his assaults upon orthodox truth he is acting as wisely as the parasite, that seeks to kill the grand old trunk that sheds vitality

into its roots. Dr. Clarke can stand against the Theodore Parkers, the Emersons, and the Frothinghams, and the gentlemen who doubt the propriety of calling Jesus *Lord*, not by any power in his effeminate compromise of a creed, but the powerful stay, which his compromise so ill merits, of the sacramental host of the Orthodox Church at his back.

Dr. Clarke's diction hardly equals in chasteness and purity what we usually expect from his cultured class. He is not, like Peabody and Hedge, an elegant writer. He is neither in statement nor in logic a precise writer. As a specimen of accuracy note the following attempt at a narrative:

> The change [in conversion] from one state to the other is assumed to be so distinct and marked that he who runs can read. One may say to another, "*Where were you converted?*" just as they may say, "*Where did you go to college?*" "Where were you born?" said an English bishop to Somerville, the Methodist preacher. "In Dublin and Liverpool," he answered. "Were you born in *two* places?" said the bishop. "Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?" replied Somerville.

The true narrative runs thus:

> While Mr. Summerfield [in America] was lying in bed during one of his illnesses, he was visited by two highly respectable clergymen, one of whom, commiserating his early subjection to such extreme suffering in consequence of his ministerial labors, inquired "How old are you?" To the astonishment of the divine the suffering saint replied: "I was born at Preston in England in 1798, and *born again* at Dublin in Ireland in 1817." The visitor expressed at once his surprise and curiosity at what to him was so strange a declaration. Mr. Summerfield, no less excited, with great propriety exclaimed in the language of Jesus to Nicodemus, 'Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?' and then related to them the history of his own conversion. The sequel is gratifying: The reverend gentleman, after departing, inquired of his clerical companion whether or not he knew anything about this strange doctrine, and finding that he too was the subject of the same happy change, set himself to obtain the like blessing, with a sincerity and success of which his subsequent ministrations bore satisfactory testimony.—*Life of John Summerfield*, p. 351.

Discourses of Redemption; as Revealed at "Sundry Times and in Divers Manners," designed both as Biblical Expositions for the People, and Hints to Theological Students of a Popular Method of Exhibiting the "Divers Relations" through Patriarchs, Prophets, Jesus, and his Apostles. By Rev. Stuart Robinson, Pastor of the Second Church, Louisville, and late Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology at Louisville, Kentucky. 8vo., pp. 448. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

These discourses are twenty in number. They are specimens of biblical expositions in sermonic form, to which the author has, through a ministry of twenty years, appropriated one of the Sabbath services. They are not a miscellaneous collection, but a series, logically developing the gospel in the order of its successive revelations. The germinal points of these revelations are discussed in the

popular forms of spoken language rather than in the precise style of theological disquisition, and will, we think, be found, as the author designed, profitable to those people who desire to know how to read the Holy Scriptures, and students who would learn this method of preaching.

Salvation from sin through vicarious blood Mr. Robinson finds to be the fundamental thought of the theology of the entire Bible. Its ritual expression, whether in Genesis or Revelation, is the sacrificial lamb. The mode of the successive revelations is through a series of covenants, each having its preparatory historic record, and its subsequent development in its history and accompanying revelations, which, in turn, become preparatory to the covenant next in order. The covenant with Adam promised a universal Redeemer. That with Noah guaranteed protection to the race, and the line of descent in Shem. The third, made with Abraham, not as head of the race but as representative of believers, organized the people of God into a formal, visible Church, composed of believers and their children, under a divine charter, "an everlasting covenant" with its sign and seal. The passover was a covenant of the redemption of this visible body, through the shedding and sprinkling of blood. The covenant of Mount Sinai provided for the government and spiritual nurture of the redeemed people. The covenant with David, instituted when the nation was fully pessessed of the temporal part of the ancient promise, typically set forth the Church as the eternal kingdom of David's Son. The prophets develop the doctrine of the kingship of the promised Redeemer over his universal kingdom; and finally the Antitype appears, completes the revelation, effects the redemption, establishes his throne, rejects from his Church the apostates who had first rejected him, and ordains the gathering into it of all nations.

The doctrine of the Church is discussed from a Presbyterian standpoint, but it is none the less valuable on that account; while they who cannot trace the Church beyond the time of the Apostles, or see that the children of believers have, as such, any rights within its pale, may here find help in their investigations.

Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the year 1866. 8vo., pp. 280. New York: Carlton & Porter.

Before these lines are read our Centenary year will have passed, and its noble work be done. It has, we trust, been such a success as our children's children will rejoice in, yet surpass. Our Gen-

eral Conference plan, with slight exception, was most wise. Our managing committee have pressed it with an energy which the Church will gratefully acknowledge. Our ministry have entered into the spirit of the work. Our noble laity have set an example of liberality that will, we trust, give a higher tone of beneficence to the whole evangelical Church of our country. Meantime we have reviewed ourself. We have retraced the faded lines of our early story. Our Church has amazingly increased, through all her body, in self-knowledge and self-consciousness. "But the best of all is, God is with us." We know it by the tokens of his Spirit in the conversion of a hundred thousand souls. Never have we had such a prosperity in the real work for which a Church exists—the winning men to the cross of Christ. The mission of Methodism is not closed; it has just commenced.

Yet we suspect that a large share of the Church took no share in the work. Have we not lost the invaluable secret we lately possessed, of making every member give something? Our class-meetings were established for this very object; and it is to be feared that first the object and then the class-meeting is slipping through our fingers. Robert Newton once said, "So long as we have the penny a week and the shilling a quarter we shall go on conquering and to conquer." Now we have lost "the penny a week and the shilling a quarter;" the spontaneous regular mite from every individual; and a stupendous loss it is. It both makes us depend on rich men, and makes rich men both despotic and discontented; despotic because they are necessary, discontented because they are often the main, if not the only givers. Bishop Morris has shown how large a total may result from very small contributions by every unit of our million. Who shall restore the lost art? Restore us that art by which the Church can give millions and not feel it but in blessed results. If our energetic Centenary committee can inaugurate this work they will have doubled the value of our Centenary year.

'We are aware that some of our Rationalistic friends tell us that such is the march of *progress* that Methodism has no second century to live; the age of religious faith will, before the coming century closes, have merged in "the age of reason." That is, however, an old hereditary boast. Julian was to "conquer the Galilean;" Voltaire was to "crush the wretch;" but the Galilean conquered Julian, and the crucified One has "crushed" Voltaire. Dr. Strauss tried to criticise the "life of Jesus" out of existence; but Jesus Christ still lives, "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever;" and unhappy Dr. Strauss, in spite of his late attempt at galvaniz-

ing himself into a resurrection, is a dead man, and terribly fitted, we fear, for a deeper than literary *damnation.* We stand, blessed be God, on the Rock of ages, and WE KNOW WHO WILL CONQUER. And as for these gentlemen's boasted *progress*, we would have them bethink themselves where *this* glorious progress is to terminate. *They* may say into *Rationalism*, enlightenment, heights of science; but Monsieur Comte says into Atheism and ultimate beastliness! His progress promises that men shall in a future age become "the unrecognizable wrecks of what had once been" civilized beings; "crawling over its surface, and degenerating, through stages of meaner and meaner vitality, back into shapelessness and extinction."* Draper holds that after the of age reason, in which we now are, is past, the age of decrepitude and idiocy will succeed. Herbert Spencer predicts an age of "equilibration," in which every particle of the universe is to be perfectly immovably still, beyond which he can see no reason for any future motion! Fit counterparts are these to Darwinism: one claims that man grew from brute; the other claims that man shall return to brute and worse than brute. Such, gentlemen Rationalists, is the goal of your *progress;* the cheering, elevating vista of your faith; the ultimatum predicted by your great prophets! John Stuart Mill is quoted as saying that the word *necessity* is "a brute of a word." And we say that all this is a brute of a philosophy; fit only for the hogs—"the hogs of Epicurus's style." We thank God for that higher nature that feels itself compelled to concentrate all its force to pronounce such doctrine of progress ACCURSED. We, too, have a doctrine of progress, quite unlike this career through Rationalism and Atheism into bestiality. We believe not in a blind nature, but in a God who rules with infinitely wise design, and to a grand and glorious ultimate. We believe in the headship of the great Redeemer, in whom man is made divine. Under His leadership there is a "progress;" a progress of the individual in knowledge, holiness, and fitness for an inheritance with the saints in light; a progress of the gospel of Christ, by means of his Church, to a universal millennial triumph; a progress of the world's history under the guidance of Providence until its consummation in the final judgment of the human race by the eternal Son of God. In this faith our fathers died—as no Rationalist ever dies—with the shout of heavenly triumph on their lips. In this faith, brightened by the progress of another century, we have an unfaltering trust that our children will rejoice with a far more abounding joy than ours.

* Masson, p. 106.

The Acts of the Deacons: being a Course of Lectures, Critical and Practical, on Acts vi–viii; and xxi, 8–15. In Two Books. Book I: The Acts of St. Stephen, the Protomartyr. Book II: The Acts of St. Philip, Evangelist. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, and One of Her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary. 18mo., pp. 408. Rivingtons, London, Oxford, and Cambridge.

Dr. Goulburn is author of several practical treatises, founded on scriptural topics, which have been republished in this country. They are scholarly and fresh, with a clear flow of animated style. They are wanting in the experimental depth of the puritan divines and of our practical Methodist writers. They abound overmuch in a spiritual showiness and in pious platitudes. The episode of the so-called seven *deacons* in Acts (they are never so called in the book itself) is rather a happy selection for treatment; and the treatment abounds in good thoughts, but the philosophy of the subject is not very profoundly sounded.

We would like to know how the author would have titled the book which tradition has named the Acts of the Apostles. But two apostles make any figure; Peter predominantly to the end of the twelfth chapter, and Paul through the remainder of the book. But under Peter's predominance the celebrated Seven, representatives apparently of the Gentilely inclined element in the Church, start forth, two of them specially, with a brilliancy that flings the apostles into the shade. Stephen, the Hellenist, is in character and sudden fate, bold, intense, and tragic. It is his great allotment to stand at the head of the glorious army of martyrs, though he belonged not to the goodly fellowship of the apostles. Philip suddenly seized the prize of first bearing the gospel beyond the Judean limits, and of sending it even to the very depths of Africa. First he alights upon Samaria, and the city is in an excitement of revival and joy. Next he darts down southward and intercepts, converts, and baptizes the Ethiopean grandee at the edge of Palestine on his route for Alexandria, thence to sail in his Nile-boat up a thousand miles to where Candace reigns in Meroe. Snatched up by the Spirit, Philip is found at Ashdod, whence he streaks up the shore of the Mediterranean, preaching as he goes, until he arrives at Cesarea. Thirty years after he is found at Cesarea with a household of four prophetess daughters. Surely this, father and daughters, is decidedly a *spirituel* family. Nothing is said of the wife of this vivid man, the mother of these prophetic daughters; perhaps she was the ballast of the family. But inartificial Luke is utterly unconscious of the life and vivacity which a modern eye detects in the figure which Philip makes.

Morning by Morning; or, Daily Readings for the Family or the Closet. By C. H. SPURGEON. 12mo., pp. 403. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1866.

We believe in metempsychosis when we read Spurgeon. He is an old-fashioned Puritan, deeply impregnated with his stern gospel in a relaxed age, hard-headed and difficult to kill, yet from his plain rugged soul continually disclosing gleams of ideality in him, which assure you that he might be "fine," nay, superfine, if he would. The present work, intended for occasional readings, is marked by deep evangelic power, and by now and then a flash of brilliancy. We give a gem or two.

Anything is better than the dead calm of indifference. Our souls may wisely desire the north wind of trouble if that alone can be sanctified to the drawing forth of the perfume of our graces. So long as it cannot be said, "The Lord was not in the wind," we will not shrink from the most wintry blast that ever blew upon plants of grace. . . . Graces unexercised are as sweet perfumes slumbering in the cups of the flowers: the wisdom of the great Husbandman overrules diverse and opposite causes to produce the one desired result, and makes both affliction and consolation draw forth the grateful odors of faith, love, patience, hope, resignation, joy, and the other fair flowers of the garden.—P. 61.

Give a man wealth; let his ships bring home continually rich freights; let the winds and waves appear to be his servants to bear his vessels across the bosom of the mighty deep; let his lands yield abundantly; let the weather be propitious to his crops; let uninterrupted success attend him; let him stand among men as a successful merchant; let him enjoy continued health; allow him with braced nerve and brilliant eye to march through the world and live happily; give him the buoyant spirit; let him have the song perpetually on his lips; let his eye be ever sparkling with joy—and the natural consequence of such an easy state to any man, let him be the best Christian who ever breathed, will be *presumption.* . . . If God should always rock us in the cradle of prosperity; if we were always dandled on the knees of fortune; if we had not some stain on the alabaster pillar; if there were not a few clouds in the sky; if we had not some bitter drops in the wine of this life, we should become intoxicated with pleasure; we should dream "we stand;" and stand we should, but it would be upon a pinnacle; like the man asleep upon the mast, each moment we should be in jeopardy.—P. 70.

Living in Earnest. With Lessons and Incidents from the Lives of the Great and Good. A Book for Young Men. By JOSEPH JOHNSON. 16mo., pp. 264. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock, 1866.

The publishers of this little volume have put into a beautiful form, sufficiently so to charm the young man whose eyes rest upon it, into its perusal, some of the noblest words addressed of late years to those whose principles are to be formed and characters moulded. It incites us to the culture of a life of earnestness, industry, charity, and piety, as our best and highest wisdom. With such topics as "Living in Work," "Living Valorously; or Learning to say No," "Living in Play," "Living in Health," illustrated by sayings and incidents in the lives of men of lofty characters and noble

deeds, and written in an eloquent, transparent style, it will not, we think, be easily laid down by him who has taken it up. It reminds us of the Country Parson and Timothy Titcomb, and yet Mr. Johnson is quite unlike them.

We heartily wish this book could go into the hands of every young man in the land.

The Acts of the Apostles. An Exegetical and Doctrinal Commentary. By GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHTER, D.D., Ordinary Professor of Theology and Superintendent at Leipsic. With Homiletical Additions by the Rev. Charles Gerok, Superintendent at Stuttgard. Translated from the German Second Edition, with Additions by Charles F. Schæffer, D.D., Professor of Theology in Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia. 8vo., pp. 480. New York: Scribner & Co. 1866.

The fourth volume of this great biblical work is promptly out, and will not disappoint the expectations of those who appreciate the value of the previous two. Lechler is a leading German theologian and biblical scholar; he is author of a "History of Deism," and has spent fifteen years upon the book of Acts as his specialty. The homiletical matter is supplied by Gerok of Stuttgard, a leading pulpit orator of Germany, and withal a successful poet. The translator, Dr. Schæffer, has made valuable additions to the various reading, to the chronological department, and to the exegesis, augmenting the last with annotations from English and American commentators. The typography is, we believe, exceedingly accurate.

Statistical History of the First Century of American Methodism. With a Summary of the Origin and Present Operations of the Denominations. By Rev. C. C. Goss. 16mo., pp. 188. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.

Mr. Goss has collected a mass of systematized statistics, designed to give a view of the comparative growth of Methodism in our country. It is a *much in little.* Both as a book of condensed history for brief perusal, and as a manual for reference, it will be found valuable. Its errors we doubt not, if any, will be diminished in future editions, and it may perhaps serve as a nucleus for something more complete.

The New Birth; or, the Work of the Holy Spirit. By AUSTIN PHELPS, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Author of "The Still Hour." 16mo., pp. 253. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1867.

Dr. Phelps is a thinker and writer, remarkable for clearness, purity, and calm quiet force. His "Still Hour" is one of the

best little manuals of religious thought that our day has produced. His present work is of course adapted to the peculiarities of his creed, and presents its doctrinal views in their best possible practical aspects. Thoughtful minds of any creed may study his pages with profit.

Philosophy, Metaphyics, and General Science.

Recent British Philosophy: a Review, with Criticisms; Including some Comments on Mr. Mill's Answer to Sir Wm. Hamilton. By DAVID MASSON. 12mo., pp. 335. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Mr. Masson writes metaphysics in a lively and richly-colored style, abounding in luxuriant circumlocutions, and often attaining a measure of flowing eloquence. His standpoint is transcendental Pantheism. With one marked exception, which we shall soon present, he is eminently candid and appreciative of the merits even of thinkers whom he opposes and assumes to refute. His view of the metaphysical discussions in England for the last thirty years is comprehensive and lucid, and worthy the study of readers well grounded in that department of thought.

Mr. Masson, after giving a catalogue of the writers during that period by him esteemed worthy of mention, gives us a classification of metaphysical opinions or parties. The generic division into Empirical (or, as he and we would prefer to say, Experiential) and Transcendental, gives little idea of the differences and agreements really existing. This is merely a variance upon the single point of the origin of our ideas. There are still three great testing topics of metaphysical thought upon which these two classes will be found to cross each other *ad libitum*, namely, Psychology, or the analysis of thought and mind; Ontology, or the doctrine of essence, substance, or reality; and Cosmology, or the theory of the universal system. That is, there is Psychology, the science of *mind;* Ontology, the science of *being;* and Cosmology, the science of the *cosmos*, whether spiritual or material.

In Psychology, do you believe that all thought is but the transcript, at first, second, third, etc. hand, of sensation? Then you are an experientialist. Do you believe that we have thoughts which are no type, at any remove, of sensation? You are transcendentalist.

In Ontology, do you hold with Locke, that there is a real outer world, actually such as our senses perceive? Then you are a natural realist. Do you, with Berkeley, say that if it is by our sensations that we know the outer world, then there is no outer world,

for our sensations are all we know, so that nothing but mind need be supposed to exist? Then you are an *idealist*. Do you go still further and say, with Hume, that as we know not matter, but only the *sensation*, so we know not mind, but only the series of thoughts, so that besides thoughts there is nothing? Then you are a *nihilist*, a nothingist. Or if you are truly a *realist*, and, going further than Locke, you affirm that the primary reality is matter, and that mind results from the properties of matter, then you are a *materialistic realist*. Or if, going not so far as Locke, you say that there is an outer world, but not such a world as we seem to know, but an *unknown outer*, by which our sensations and perceptions are caused? Then you are a *constructive realist*. Or, finally, do you hold that matter and mind are manifestations of one common substance? That is the doctrine of *absolute identity*. So that we have in the doctrine of being these five views: Nihilism, Materialistic Realism or Materialism, Natural Realism, Constructive Realism, and Absolute Identity. In Cosmology you may be Theist, Pantheist, Atheist.

Of the entire metaphysical era, the two great masters are Sir William Hamilton and John Stuart Mill. The former is a transcendentalist, a natural realist, and a theist. The latter is in psychology an empiricist; in ontology, an idealist; and in cosmology, *perhaps* a theist. Mr. Masson discusses their two philosophies largely, especially the latter. Criticising Mill's late review of Hamilton, he pronounces it a most masterly production, but by no means leaving the transcendentalist without ample and valid reply. The great philosophic schism is not healed. Happily, for the occupation of the metaphysical doctors would then be at an end, and the chances for uttering a great deal of nonsense would be forever foreclosed. Mr. Masson concludes that the two great opposites, empiricism and transcendentalism, necessarily terminate in "*nihilism, or summation in an absolute*," that is, pantheism. One or other of these, he is sure, is true; and the true one in his opinion is the latter. In our humble opinion they neither necessarily so terminate, and neither of the two termini is true.

Mr. Masson is generally courteous; but there are two objects upon which he seems to exercise an undue contempt: the former is the clergy, the latter is an earnest confession of Theism. He repeatedly alludes to the increasing disrespect for the clergy, and quotes especially John Stuart Mill and Sir William Hamilton. Thus, the former complaining of the dearth of metaphysical thought in England, says: "Among few, except sectarian religionists—and what they are we all know—is there any interest in the great prob-

lem of man's nature and life." And so, after having spoken repeatedly of Sir William Hamilton's "passionate theism," Mr. Masson ejects the following two sentences:

> Nothing is more characteristic of Sir William Hamilton than the occurrence of such hot theistic phrases in his purely speculative discussions. They never occur irreverently, and certainly never in the form of those disgusting *petitiones principii* which are so rife in the argumentations of clerical and other writers, who in their virulent eagerness to blaspheme an opponent whom they cannot answer, clutch at the words Atheist and its cognates, as a street blackguard does at stones or mud.

These words seem to betray not merely discourtesy but sensitiveness. If Mr. Masson, in any future publication which it seems probable he is about to make, intends to advocate Pantheism, we presume his clerical and other opponents will pronounce it Pantheism; or if Atheism, Atheism. In either case he ought manfully to accept the term. If those doctrines are true and just, their maintainers should not shrink at their name. And as for the *petitiones principii* of the clergy, we apprehend they are surpassed in that article by their metaphysical brethren, and that that is one reason why, by said metaphysician's own account, the science has nearly died out in their hands. Professor Ferrier, for instance, published a volume entitled Epistemology, in which he assumes at start, as undeniable by any one, *the absolute identity of knowing and being;* that is, of thought and substance. This was perhaps rather a tall *petitio principii;* but Mr. Masson thinks that the death of Professor Ferrier was a loss to the science. We think the fewer such speculatists the better.

Mr. Masson falls into some wrong conclusions by confounding the supernatural with the absolute. Ordinarily the supernatural is antithetical to the natural, the absolute to the phenomenal. The absolute is the unknown sub-stratum underlying the phenomenal, while the phenomenal is equivalent to the apparent or perceptible. But this absolute is not identical with the supernatural. By his own acknowledgment, if the Spiritualistic or other apparitions are real, though supernatural, they are still phenomenal, because cognized by our mind. The phenomenal, therefore, is the same as the cognizable; and *all being* cognizable by any intelligence is phenomenal to that intelligence. Hence to be a supernatural being is not to be an absolute. God himself, if cognizable by any the highest intelligence, is that much phenomenal; and the Divine Being, being perfectly known by himself, is to himself phenomenal. What, then, is the absolute other than the relatively uncognizable? And this may show how mistaken Mr. Masson, with many other would-be philosophers, is in identifying the Deity with a metaphysical absolute.

The Origin of the Stars, and the Causes of their Motions and their Light. By JACOB ENNIS, Principal of the Scientific and Classical Institute, Philadelphia, etc. 12mo., pp. 394. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 443 and 445 Broadway. 1866.

The main point of Mr. Ennis's book, as well as the object for which he writes, is to set forth a discovery which he supposes himself to have made. The cause of the rotary motion of the stars, of their orbital motion around the sun, nay, the very existence of suns, stars, satellites, and asteroids, is one and singular, namely, *gravitation*. He assumes first, though he afterward assumes to demonstrate, the truth of the nebula theory. All matter primordially existed in a state of diffusion, produced by the law of atomic revulsion throughout the universe, in a state more subtile, by many billion times, than the gas by which our balloons are raised. A separation took place from condensation, produced by chemical action. Why this chemical power just then, for the first time in eternity, commenced to exist or to act, he does not assume to explain, but takes that commencement as the starting point of his theory. The nebula would not break up into globes, for such forms could not fill space. They would break up into cubes or some irregular form; and of these cubes the corners or projections would flow down upon the sides, forming many currents, and these currents would fuse into a single stream, flowing round a growingly globular mass. Meantime the surface would be continually sinking by contraction of the mass; a perpetual descent would thereby be furnished for the stream, and the flow would continue forever. Gradually, by means of friction, the force of the current on the surface would produce a rotary motion of the whole mass. Thus by degrees a central sun would be formed. But the current of the outer flow would often be too rapid for the movement of the mass; it would shell off and become a ring, which ring would either remain a ring or become transformed into a globe, by the same process as the first solar mass assumed that shape. Thus the planetary shapes were formed. By an equally ingenious train of reasoning Mr. Ennis proceeds to show that the same power would produce both the centripetal and centrifugal forces, and send the planets with their actual velocities through their actual orbits.

One of the first results of condensation was combustion, and consequent flame; so that Mr. Ennis's Genesis, like that of Moses, begins with light. He believes, and professes to prove, the sun to be an immense mass of flame, fed by a fuel far more unconsumable, and of far greater heating and lighting power, than any substance our planet

possesses. He ratifies the theory that our planet, too, is a globe of fire crusted over. Thence he is able to make a transition to geology, and rapidly trace the changes which have resulted in our present terrene condition. He accepts with all geologists at the present day the doctrine of Sir Charles Lyell, that the earth's present geological state has been produced by causes, forces, and laws now in existence and operation. He accepts, too, the doctrine of Charles Darwin, that our present vegetable and animal natures were also brought into existence by processes now in operation. The simplest primordial form of animal life was the slightest "round cell," from which, by the natural laws of variation and conditional survivorship, the highest forms of animal life have arisen, ultimating so far in man. Man has been upon the earth hundreds of thousands of years. How that primordial cell first attained form or life he omits to say. To what ultimate state of perfection man may attain during the next billion of years he does not prophesy. But from the first schism in the nebula to the present moment, creation proper, under its proper laws, has been progressive, is still in progress, and its whole grand system is one.

Dr. Chalmers once wrote a magnificent essay, in which, admitting that no argument for the existence of a God could be deduced from the bare existence of matter, he grounded the whole theistic argument, so far as astronomy was concerned, upon what he termed the "collocations of matter." Matter might be eternal. But the exquisite assignment of the planets to their places in the solar system could be accounted for on no principles of law, but demanded and demonstrated an intelligent exertion of power. Now Mr. Ennis claims, alas! to have shown that these collocations have been produced by the law of gravitation. Yet though he has apparently invalidated Dr. Chalmers's argument for a God, Mr. Ennis is scarcely less a reverent theist than Dr. Chalmers himself. He writes more in the devout spirit of Newton and Kepler than in the sullen frigidity of Comte and Spencer. He admires and adores the wisdom and power by which results so magnificent are produced by forces so simple. He admits no chance in the process, and recognizes the nebula itself as but a vail of the eternal behind it. He does not, indeed, suggest the inquiry whether his theory of man's creation disturbs the validity of the Mosaic text, or requires a new interpretation to be substituted for that which has perhaps been dictated to it by the authority of the then current science. Mr. Ennis is master of a pure clear style, and of unusual powers of lucid exposition.

The Mystery of the Soul: A Search into Man's Origin, Nature, and Destiny. By S. W. FULLOM, Royal Hanoverian Gold Medalist for Art and Science. 12mo., pp. 304. London: Charles J. Street.

Our Royal Medalist, a practical excavator, is satisfied that the fossil results hitherto attained do not furnish valid proof of the immense antiquity of the human race. He is, nevertheless, convinced that pre-adamic anthropoid races did exist, and finds traces in the Bible. He believes that this concession is necessary to save Scripture and science from contradiction. The celebrated passage, Gen. ii, 7, as he maintains, narrates not the creation of Adam, but his transition from a lower to a higher being; from an anthropoid to an immortal human nature. Although no linguistic scholar, he does, by the aid of scholars, make out a better case than we had supposed possible, though defective in points he does not imagine; and perhaps even a better case may be evolved than he makes. Let us see. We may thus literally translate the verse:*

"And God developed the man—dust of the earth—and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, and the man became to a living person."

The word *developed* is here used because the Hebrew verb literally and radically signifies that process by which a potter *develops* a mass of clay upon his wheel into a vessel. He draws it up into a completed shape. So God, to whom ages are moments, may have developed a progressive being up to a complete bodily organism of man. *Dust* is in the Hebrew, as in the Greek, in apposition with *Man*. *Dust*, as the primal material, stands in antithesis with the divine *breath* with which it was soon inspired. In contrast with all the previous animals produced by God, who drew their *breath* from surrounding nature, man's vital organism is filled with a breath from God's own essence. It is by this that the developed organism of man attains to his place and nature as a living person. *Living person*, we say, instead of *living soul*, as in our version. For the phrase here rendered *living soul* is in the first chapter, verses 21, 24, rendered *living creature*, and applied to the lower orders of animals. It really indicates that vital constitutive power

* We give the Hebrew with the different versions:

HEBREW: וַיִּיצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

SEPTUAGINT: *Καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς καὶ εγένετο ὁ ἄνθωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.*

VULGATE: Formavit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terræ, et inspiravit in faciem ejus spiraculum vitæ, et factus est homo in animam viventem.

It will be seen that our version obtains the preposition before *dust* from neither the Hebrew nor the Greek, but the Latin.

which establishes a species, whether animal or human, and formatively organizes and animates the individual of a species. It surely cannot be meant that it was by the divine breath that man became a mere animal. By that breath he became a *living soul* as man; a *person* instead of an animal. An animal *living soul* is a *living animal;* a human *living soul* is a *living person.* The anthropoid soul was animal; the anthropoid soul *plus* the divine breath was a *living person.* The Hebrew words for *living person* are preceded in the Hebrew by the preposition usually rendered *to* or *for.* So that, thus construed, the meaning would be, that, after God had developed man to his completed bodily organism, it was by the divine inbreathing that he attained to his present position as a personal being, immortal as the breath that constitutes his nature. This inbreathing, being from God, brings man into that perfected image of God, (Gen. i, 26,) by which man is fitted for paradise and heaven, provided he fall not from his first estate. Now we cannot be responsible for this rendering of the verse; but if required by the facts of nature and history, it is more consonant with the phraseology of the Hebrew than any interpretation we have seen of the first chapter of Genesis which reads it as historic prose. At any rate it might suggest to Mr. Fullom, that if no scripture-believer need be a Darwinian, no Darwinian need necessarily reject Moses.

New Physiognomy; or, Signs of Character as Manifested through Temperament and External Forms, and especially in "the Human Face Divine." By SAMUEL R. WELLS, Editor of "The Phrenological Journal and Life Illustrated." With more than One Thousand Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 768. New York: Fowler & Wells. 1866.

There are minds which will ever be fascinated with the tantalizing inquiry into their future destiny or into their present character. Astrology with its transparent baselessness will never wholly die. Phrenology and Physiognomy, with an indefinite amount of truth in them, will always possess believers and experimentists. They are ever encountering striking verifications, so mingled with falsifications, explainable only by a logic that weakens all certainty in them, that about the same proportion of acceptance and rejection of their claims permanently exists in the public mind. They cannot take the position of a science; they will ever possess the interest of a debatable and tantalizing question on a taking point, with a temptation to experiment.

In the present volume Mr. Wells, with a very full mastery of his subject, and in very pleasant style, takes in all the methods

of conjecturing character from external signs. He seems to assume that nearly every visible particle of the person, besides some of the invisible, is a manifesto of personal traits. The work abounds with suggestive, and often with instructive statements. Its tendency is decidedly in favor of moral right. In its department it is of course a standard, coming from the standard quarter.

History, Biography, and Topography.

A History of the Gipsies: with Specimens of the Gipsy Language. By Walter Simson. Edited, with Preface, Introduction, and Notes, and a Disquisition on the Past, Present, and Future of Gipsydom. By James Simson. 12mo., pp. 575. New York: M. Doolady. 1866.

Have we gipsies among us? Yea, verily, if Mr. Simson is to be believed, they swarm our country in secret legions. There is no place on the four quarters of the globe where some of them have not penetrated. Even in New England a sly gipsy girl will enter the factory as employe, will by her allurements win a young Jonathan to marry her, and, in due season the 'cute gentleman will find himself the father of a young brood of intense gipsies. The mother will have opened to her young progeny the mystery and the romance of its lineage, will have disclosed its birthright connection with a secret brotherhood, whose profounder free-masonry is based on blood, historically extending itself into the most dim antiquity, and geographically spreading over most of the earth. The fascinations of this mystic tie are wonderful. Afraid or ashamed to reveal the secret to the outside world, the young gipsy is inwardly intensely proud of his unique nobility, and is very likely to despise his alien father, who is of course glad to keep the late discovered secret from the world. Hence, dear reader, you know not but your next neighbor is a gipsy; nay, if you are a swarthy genius, with a dark, glittering eye, a restless temperament, and with intense internal prompting toward roaming, lying, and thieving, the probability is you are yourself a gipsy.

The volume before us possesses a rare interest both from the unique character of the subject, and from the absence of nearly any other source of full information. It is the result of observation fresh from real life. The work of the senior Simson was commenced in Blackwood's Magazine more than twenty years ago. Abundant and notorious as were the gipsy tribes in Scotland, so little had they been studied, and so little was their interior known, that

the novelty of the exhibit rendered the articles exceedingly popular. Sir Walter Scott, whose interest was greatly awakened by the subject, dissuaded the continuance of the articles, as likely to awaken the jealousy of the gipsies, and thereby lock up the sources of further information.

The gipsies first made their advent into Europe from Asia, and probably from Hindostan, in the fifteenth century. Their tradition boasts that they came in splendid style, but were met with such suspicion and hostility on the part of the peoples of Europe as to depreciate and ruin their fortunes. Persecutions of the most cruel character have embittered and barbarized them, so that they have lived in scattered camps in the various parts of Christendom, hunted and hostile, making their living by whatever unscrupulous means, as on an enemy's grounds. Even now, in an age of a higher Christian civilization, they do not realize the kindly feeling of enlightened minds toward them, and view with fierce suspicion every approach designed to draw from them the secrets of their history, habits, laws, and language.

Of their origin it seems they can themselves give no reliable account. Their name, *gipsy*, is a corruption of the word *Egyptian*. Mr. Simson adopts the theory that they are the descendants of the "mixed multitude" who are described in Exodus as departing with Israel from Egypt, consisting mainly, as some say, of a cross-breed of the Egyptian and Arab; but, as Mr. Simson prefers to think, consisting of the remnant of the race of the shepherd kings who ruled Egypt previous to the Pharaonic dynasty, by which both they and the Israelites were enslaved together. Thence he maintains this "mixed multitude" went to Hindostan, and there acquired the language and character with which they migrated into Europe.

It is probably from their language, if a knowledge of it can ever be fully obtained, that any true insight into their history will ever be derived. That language is no mere slang or jargon, but a structural homogeneous tongue. It is spoken with varying dialects in different countries, but with standard purity in Hungary. It is the precious inheritance and proud peculiarity of the gipsy, which he will he never forget and seldom reveal. The varied and skillful maneuvers of Mr. Simson to purloin or wheedle out a small vocabulary, with the various effects of the operation on the minds and action of the gipsies, furnish many an amusing narrative in these pages. Not until some educated gipsy gentleman shall, in accordance with the liberal spirit of the age, unfold the unwritten language of the race, will its secret become history and science to the world. This

will, we trust, in time be accomplished. The age of racial caste is passing away. Modern Christianity will refuse to tolerate the spirit of hostility and oppression based on feature, color, or lineage. When this heart-stirring truth is fully realized the timid and suspicious tribes will come into faith and brotherhood, and the universal kingdom of God will be founded on a universally acknowledged manhood.

The work of the editor is in the main well done. There is indeed a considerable garrulity and repetition in his "dissertation;" his style is often colloquial, with sometimes even a near approach to slang. Upon page 525 there is a paragraph of very unnecessary ribaldry. But the general spirit of the work is eminently enlightened, liberal, and humane. His book is an intended first step for the improvement of the race that forms its subject, and every magnanimous spirit must wish that it may prove not the last. We heartily commend the work to our readers as not only full of fascinating details, but abounding with points of interest to the benevolent Christian heart. Mr. Doolady has done up the work in handsome style.

Mr. Simson furnishes proof amounting to a very fair probability that John Bunyan was a gipsy in race. The fact, if demonstrated, would be interesting, and would by no means diminish our interest in that wonderful man, or in this singular, we might say, wonderful race.

History of the United States from the Discovery of the American Continent. By GEORGE BANCROFT. Vol. ix, 8vo., pp. 506. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1866.

While the stupendous events of a *second* great revolution have been filling the world with its resoundings, the mind of our eminent historian has been tracing the career of the *first*. This terrible second has been required in order to complete the sadly unfinished mission of the first, and that very fact warns us to beware lest any shortcomings at the present hour should leave the necessity of a *third*. After having been familiarized with the vast armies and magnificent movements of our late civil war, the grandeur of our first revolutionary war seems reduced to an almost contemptible minimum. But the end is in the beginning; the future is in the present; and the outlines of the greatness of our age existed within the littleness of our youth.

The present volume is the ninth of Mr. Bancroft's American history, and the second of his history of the Revolutionary war. It covers the events ftom the first landing of the British army on

our shores to the surrender of Burgoyne, and the formation of our alliance with France. The successive retreats of Washington, yielding up Long Island, New York, the Westchester section, his crossing the Hudson into New Jersey, and his recession southward through New Jersey until his brilliant reaction upon Trenton and Princeton, are depicted with the pencil of a master. Yet an obscurity is left upon the whole field, arising from the total absence of maps and battle plans. The absolute omission of these conveniences in this age of pictorials and diagrams is amazing.

Throughout the whole history the character of Washington appears truly and almost solely great, especially great amid the greatest emergency and crisis, great in moral grandeur, and great even in military *genius*. The unsparing pen of the historian sadly but calmly demolishes the fame of nearly every American general —the British generals had long since been done for—save Washington alone. The treasons of Charles Lee, the Thersites of this Iliad, are completely comic. And scarce less ludicrous are the cases of Gates and Lincoln in the capture of Burgoyne, cowards and dunces transformed into factitious heroes by the brave uprising of the hardy population of the north, rushing to the rescue of their country, by the capture of the bold invader. Thus we have in our providential history, lesson the first and lesson the second. In both our great revolutions the Divine ruler has seen fit to illustrate with how little great leadership a great and thoughtful people can accomplish the largest and noblest results.

With advancing age Mr. Bancroft's rhetoric grows less ambitious, yet more acceptable. There is occasionally an over-rhetorical phrase; and at the conclusion of his narrative of the death of General Frazer there is interpolated a strain of prose poetry, out of keeping with the usual texture of the style. Mr. Bancroft delights to linger amid the groups of illustrious European statesmen and sages, and to trace the advancing steps of intellectual, ethical and political philosophy. His every paragraph is animated with a philanthropic, liberal, and progressive spirit. And it is most gratifying to be able to say, that if ever Mr. Bancroft has in any degree modeled himself after the style of Gibbon, he has never imbibed the ostentatiously skeptical spirit of that great historian. In studying the pages of this our standard American history, our young men will not become imbued with the anti-christian temper. Mr. Bancroft's writings abound with no frigid allusions to the "current theology," "the popular religion of the day," so fashionable with a certain set. His liberality analyzes with respect the workings of theologic thought of past Christian ages.

A beautiful essay of his, some years since, strikingly described the elevating effects produced upon mankind by the doctrine of the incarnation. His glowing eulogy upon Edwards, published somewhat unsuitably in Appleton's Encyclopedia, as well as some passages in the present volume, indicate a somewhat unexpected sympathy with Calvinism. And what is still more unexpected, we find at page 503 a sharp stroke at Arminianism which happily does not hit. "A richly endowed Church always leans to Arminianism and justification by works." We had supposed Mr. Bancroft too good a theologian to be unaware that Arminianism denies the doctrine of justification by works. We had supposed him too well acquainted with dogmatic history, thus to impute to Arminianism the fatal taint of Pelagianism. He might as well have imputed to Arminianism the doctrine of predestination. The very mission of Arminianism was, in the striking language of our great theologian, Richard Watson, to furnish "a body of divinity adapted to the present state of theological literature, neither Calvinistic on the one hand nor Pelagian on the other."

Cognate with this error of our standard American history, is worse error of our standard American dictionary. The last edition of Webster's great lexicon furnishes the following as the third of the five points of the Arminian creed: "That man, in order to exercise true faith, must be regenerated, and renewed by the operation of the Holy Spirit, which is the gift of God." Now this is one of the articles of Calvinism against which the Arminians take issue. The Arminians maintain that true faith is the antecedent and the condition of regeneration. Our standard dictionary imputes to Arminians that very Calvinian arbitrariness of the divine ministration, against which they have ever revolted. It is very singular that the historian, who seems to have made in his own lifetime the transition from Pelagianism to Calvinism, should not recognize that Arminianism is neither. It is quite as singular that New Haven, which has made something like the reverse transition, should make the same mistake.

The Great Rebellion: its Recent History, Rise, Progress, and Disastrous Failure. By John Minor Botts, of Virginia. The Political Life of the Author Vindicated. 12mo., pp. 402. Harper & Brothers. 1866.

Mr. Botts, like Senator Foote, has drawn the picture of the southern oligarchy and its secession from a southern but loyal standpoint. Nullification, secession, the right of a state to withdraw

from the nationality, he shows to be unanimously denied by the early southern statesmen, and contradicted by their universal denunciations of the Hartford Convention as treasonable. The dark secession theory took its origin from the disappointed ambition of that prince of traitors, John C. Calhoun, who foresaw that the policy of freedom and immigration was transferring the power forever from the South to the North. Slavery inspired the spirit of insatiable domination, which could not brook this loss of supremacy, and furnished a central point for southern concentration; but by depriving the South of a base of popular yeomanry, and preventing those industries by which war resources are produced, it rendered her impotent in the hour of that very contest to which it prompted her. For thirty years the proud but truly feeble oligarchy sought to "fire the southern heart;" and yet, even with what the South had of a *people* it tried in vain, and was forced to adopt at last the most violent and treacherous methods to "precipitate" (that was the conspirators' word) the states into unwilling rebellion. For this purpose, among other expedients, they divided the Democratic party into two sections, and infatuated Charleston illuminated her windows at the news of Lincoln's election! "Precipitated" by these leaders, the unfortunate people, who at first opposed, felt *themselves* committed to secession and war. Almost the whole rushed into the sad contest which had been for three decades thus treacherously prepared for them; and the result is that the dream of domination is forever past. Overwhelmed and prostrate, they are left with nothing, civilly, but the rights of conquered insurrection, subject to the authority of the government they tried to divide, but *with no claim to any share in its control.* But to a humane nationality it belongs to prescribe no terms but such as shall exclude those leading precipitators, who victimized the people, from all future power of mischief, and secure the future peace and unity of the nation upon the broadest principles of universal manhood right, and state equality.

This contest between North and South is transient. The West, the mighty West, comes bounding into exultant existence and boundless empire. She rises over our horizon like a young omnipotence. The thunder tones of freedom, the death knell of obsolete oligarchy, come rolling from her sky. She will soon obliterate, as with the swelling surges of an incoming ocean, all traces of the old antithesis between our little eastern North and South. But in principle she is intensely one with freedom and nationality; and North and West are rolling on the day when our South will be in spirit and in institutions completely one with both. The sectional spirit

that creates caste, that abolishes the free common school, that suppresses free discussion, that excludes immigration, that despises industry and destroys prosperity and progress, must disappear. The broad sunny plains of the south must be filled with a free, educated, industrious, prosperous yeomanry, and freedom must inaugurate the era of a new and nobler South. Unless the southron is born with a twisted neck, and a face reversed and perpetually looking backward, let him promptly and forever renounce the dead, buried, and putrid past, and heroically cast forward his welcoming eyes toward the new and better age.

The Decline of the French Monarchy. By Henri Martin. Translated from the Fourth Paris Edition, by Mary L. Booth. 2 vols. 8vo. Boston: Walker, Fuller, & Co. 1866.

Henri Martin's *History of France* is one of the most thoroughly conscientious works of modern times. When only twenty-three years of age Martin engaged in a scheme for publishing a compilation from all the best historians of France; but after working at it a while he determined to write the history *de novo*. It became the task of his life. The first edition appeared in 1833–36, in fifteen volumes. Its conclusion was only the signal for a new labor; beginning at the beginning, with greatly enlarged resources of intellect, as well as of material, the author made a new work of his second edition, which appeared at intervals from 1837 to 1854 in nineteen octavo volumes. The fourth edition is now in the market. The success of the work in France has been very great. It is not ranked, indeed, with Thierry's masterpieces; but it comes next to them. The Academy of Inscriptions decreed the Gobert prize in 1844 to the tenth and eleventh volumes, which treated of the *war of religion* in France. The later volumes, (xiii–xvi,) on the *age of Louis XIV.*, received the second prize from the French Academy in 1851 and the first prize in 1852.

Miss Booth has been well inspired in undertaking the translation of this noble work, and we trust she will be enabled to go on to its completion. She began, it appears, with the thirteenth and fourteenth volumes of the original, containing *The Age of Louis XIV.;* but the publishers have not sent us that part of the work. The present issue contains the fifteenth and sixteenth volumes of the original, extending from the establishment of the regency in 1715 to the revolution of 1789. It traverses, therefore, one of the darkest periods of human history, depicting the unhappy reign of the base and feeble Duke of Orleans as regent; the beastly life

and fatal administration of Louis XV.; the opening of the new era in the American Revolution; and the preparatory steps in government, letters, philosophy, and religion, toward the great catastrophe in which the worn-out feudal monarchy of France was finally engulfed. The spirit of the work is everywhere elevated and noble; its philosophy acknowledges the hand of God in history, and is far removed from the modern Pantheistic exclusion of Providence; while its description of society and its narrative movement are always graphic and spirited, as well as carefully accurate. In the present installment of the work, Voltaire, the Encyclopædists, and Rousseau occupy naturally a large space, and are treated with discriminating skill. But the author's admiring pity for Rousseau has, we think, carried him too far in excusing the base elements in the soul of that wonderful genius. Miss Booth's translation is generally well done. It would be well for her to adopt and adhere to some definite rule in translating proper names, so as to avoid such discrepancies as giving in the same sentence the "Duke du Maine," a title half French, half English; and the "Duke of Orleans," a title all English. M.

Ireland and the Centenary of American Methodism. By Rev. William Crook. 12mo., pp. 263. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1866.

This is a valuable addition to the works already published in relation to the Centenary of American Methodism. The writer is a respectable Wesleyan minister in Ireland, and the son of the honored Rev. William Crook, lately gone to his reward. His subject is one in which he evidently is deeply interested. His style is perspicuous, pleasing, and forceful. His materials are very naturally arranged, and the following facts are clearly elucidated. The Palatines were Protestants of Germany. In consequence of the violent persecution raised against them by the Papists they left their homes, and some hundreds of them removed to Ireland, and settled principally in the county of Limerick in 1709. In 1749 the Methodist preachers proclaimed the gospel in the neighborhood, and shortly after Barbara Heck and Philip Embury joined the society. In 1758 Wesley held a conference in Limerick, when Embury and William Thompson, the first president of the British Conference, were proposed for the itinerant work. Embury was not appointed to a circuit, and in November following he married a relative, Mary Switzer. In about eighteen months they, with Paul and Barbara Heck, and others of their party, emigrated

to these shores, arriving in New York August 1760. After an unaccountable silence for six years, Embury preached the first Methodist sermon in New York, to only five hearers, in his own house, Barrack-street, now Park Place, October 1766. Two years after old John-street Church was opened by him for worship. In 1770 he removed to Ashgrove, where he died in 1773. His wife, with Paul and Barbara Heck, then removed to Canada. We have also an interesting chapter on Robert Strawbridge, who emigrated from Ireland, and introduced Methodism into Maryland about 1766. There is some evidence to show that the first Methodist class in Canada was organized at Augusta, in the house of the widow of Embury, who had married John Lawrence, from Ireland; and that Lawrence Coughlan was the first who unfurled the Methodist banner in Eastern British America. These, and other interesting matters connected with the origin and success of Methodism in America, and especially its indebtedness to Ireland, receive ample justice from Mr. Crook's able pen. The four engravings enhance the worth of this fascinating and instructive little volume, which we cordially recommend to our youthful readers. It is appropriately dedicated "to the Rev. Robinson Scott, D.D., the first deputation from the Irish Conference to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America: as a memorial of private friendship." D.

The Great American Conflict. A History of the Great Rebellion in the United States of America, 1860–5. Its Causes, Incidents, and Results. Intended to Exhibit especially its Moral and Political Phases, with the Drift and Progress of American Opinion respecting Human Slavery from 1776 to the Close of the War for the Union. By HORACE GREELEY. Illustrated by Portraits on Steel of Generals, Statesmen, and other Eminent Men; Views of Places of Historic Interest; Maps, Diagrams of Battle-fields, Naval Actions, etc. From Official Sources. Volume II. 8vo., pp. 782. Hartford: O..D. Case & Co.

Owing to Mr. Greeley's great mastery of the subject, derived from his position as a leading journalist, his work will, for the time being, assume an authority as the standard history of the great conflict. He has very much thrown off the style and feeling of a partisan writer; he deals in no one-sided paragraphs; he avoids even giving decisive opinions, leaving simply to his array of facts the business of enabling the reader to form his own opinion.

Mr. Greeley has very little ideality in his mind, and very little of pictorial descriptiveness, of glowing narration, or of impassioned rhetoric. He has been accustomed to deal in a spirit of high earnestness with facts and principles. His present work is not a model

of vivid narrative style. Remarkable as always for clearness and force, his periods are careless, being often composed of a series of mere loose-strung clauses and members, drawn out at great length.

Politics and battles form the staple. With all his humanitarian feeling and principle Mr. Greeley pays but slight tribute to the great Christian movements of benevolent operation. And this leads us to add a point to what we said in our first notice in regard to Mr. Greeley's unpardonable injustice, especially to the religious bodies, on the subject of slavery. In vol. i, page 120, Mr. Greeley has the following notable sentence: "The Methodists in the infancy of their communion were gathered mainly from among the poor and despised classes, and had *much more affiliation with slaves than with their masters.*" That is, they were mostly negroes. For if we should say that Mr. Greeley had more affiliation with simpletons than with sensible men, we would certainly be understood to say that Mr. Greeley was rather a simpleton. It is seldom he writes so completely like one.

Personal Recollections of Distinguished Generals. By WILLIAM F. G. SHANKS. 12mo., pp. 347. New York. 1866.

Mr. Shanks's position as reporter for the "New York Herald" gave him peculiar opportunities of judging our generals by personal observation. He possesses as a writer much vigor and pictorial power. Sherman, he thinks, is one side of a great general and Sheridan another; Grant is both sides. Our war revealed few great generals at the North; and, with the exception of Joe Johnston, none at the South. Perhaps he depreciates the military genius of Lee below the verdict of facts. It is no compliment to our generalship to have been defeated, or squarely checked, so many times, and held at bay so long, by an opponent of no military ability.

The Conversion of the Northern Nations. The Boyle Lectures for the Year 1865. Delivered at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D., Rector of Lawford; Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons. Author of "A History of the Romans under the Empire." 12mo., pp. 231. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

This elegant volume is the counterpart and completion of Merivale's previous work on the conversion of the Roman empire, noticed in a former Quarterly. Both form a masterly synoptical view of the rise and ascendancy of Christianity over Europe. Led not so much by minute specific events as by the great current

of the ages, we obtain a comprehensive view of the great historic process. The work possesses a standard value to the Christian and the literary thinker.

An American Family in Germany. By J. Ross Browne. Illustrated by the Author. 12mo., pp. 381. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

Mr. Ross Browne is highly ubiquitous. California, the East, the land of Thor, and Algeria, are all localities in which he accidentally happens. In this volume he dives to the center; plunges and immerses himself in Deutschland. He is sharp of eye and nimble of tongue. He is full of merry extravaganzas; sees things in burlesque aspects, and knows how to "set the wild echoes flying" with syllables of rollick and riot. Folks who find a sober description of foreign lands tiresome, may laugh and grow wise over his pages.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

How New York City is Governed. By James Parton. (Reprinted from the North American Review.) 12mo., pp. 48. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

Mr. Parton's celebrated article in the North American Review, of which this is a republication, does but present in detail before the mind what in the gross everybody knows. New York city contains within herself the elements of her own destruction, a destruction that would soon be accomplished but for aid from abroad. That element is an uneducated, unprincipled foreign population, coming in annual myriads, of which the very dregs remain within her bosom, almost immediately empowered by a vote to rule the city. Were the Irishman, indeed, like the negro, a homeless loyal Protestant, education and an established interest with the country would here at the North have long since made him safe and beneficial. But the ignorance and vice are foreign-born, and ever incoming and overwhelming. *There are sixty thousand voters whose interests are in favor of a government by desperadoes and robbers, and who vote directly for such result.* Left to its relentless victimizers, property would either slowly depreciate, and the city by depopulated to a desert, or rapid riot would reduce her to quick incendiarism and final pillage. When the republican legislature first began to interfere, to rescue the city from its impending fate, Fernando Wood, then mayor, raised

an armed rebellion which the power of the state, led by Governor King, could easily overawe; but Wood had the greater muscular force of the city on his side, and New York could have been as absolutely subjected to the despot Fernando I., as ever Italian city was to its petty duke. We all remember the terrible negro riots in 1863; we remember that in our nation's crisis so disloyal was this dangerous element, that a part of our national army had to be dispatched from the front of war, to repress rebellion in Broadway and the Five Points. In short we have—worse than an elephant—a terrible HYDRA on our hands; and we must either lay him, or suddenly or slowly he will destroy us.

Happy for New York city in the past, that the same "democracy," of which this sixty thousand is the concentrated quintessence, did not rule the state. To the interposition of a republican legislature, elected by the rural districts, New York owes her preservation thus far. This is a precarious, even if a legitimate source of safety. The remedy, as Mr. Parton suggests, must be established in the new state constitution to be framed by the convention soon to be called. The methods he suggests are an educational and direct-tax suffrage, fewer offices to be filled by popular elections, and some sort of city high court, consisting of men of probity and property, for trying and punishing official thieves.

The city government of New York, including Brooklyn, is a matter of vital interest to the entire state of New York, which is overshadowed and almost overwhelmed by it. Predominantly in her governmental character she is an Irish-Romish city, and the very last election shows in how terrible an antagonism she stands both in policy and in interest to the rest of the state. Yet every state, the entire nation, is deeply concerned in the same matter of the growing destructive political element in the metropolitan cities. Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, and their sisters are all traveling the same downward road. Not a moment must we defer our awaking to a consciousness of our danger.

This is a topic for the Church, for her laymen, her press, her pulpit. The moral, religious, civil interests of our people are at stake. The Citizens' Association of this city is doing a noble work. Mr. Parton recommends affiliated associations throughout New York and Brooklyn. Should not our ministers and laity be forward in such a movement?

One of the most demoralizing and dangerous elements in existence is *the authorized and encouraged organization of an* IRISH *nationality within our midst.* We have a nation within our

nation, armed and concerted, conscious of its strength, and relatively strong by union. How disloyal that element was in our late struggle, how seditious its anti-war and negro riots, we all know. That the Fenian junto attempted an invasion on a peaceful neighboring people is bad enough; that it may turn its hostilities in any other direction it chooses—to strike the country perhaps some fatal blow in the next terrible crisis—is still more dangerous. When the political party that could elect a Morrissey to Congress sustains this organized misrule, it only acts its own base nature; but that any republican element, belonging to the party of civilization and progress, should coquette with the monster, is itself monstrous.

Superstition and Force. Essays on the Wager of Law—the Wager of Battle, the Ordeal—Torture. By HENRY C. LEA. 8vo., pp. 407. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. 1866.

The writer of this work, with an affluent erudition in his department, traces several great phases of the social system through the middle ages, and deduces, or furnishes us with the means to deduce, the lessons and reflections they suggest. Special histories of this kind have their value, though, by giving emphasis to particular elements, they are apt to produce erroneous views of the history as a whole. The two great institutions of battle wager and ordeal were based upon one assumption, namely, that we are able to call in a divine interference in behalf of our right when we choose. Such an assumption, unless in a system more or less supernatural, as the Mosaic, human experience has shown to be false.

Mr. Lea writes in a grave, clear, scholarly, and judicial style. Though he traces some of the greatest errors which religion and conscience, guided by false science or no science, have committed, he is far from denying the validity of either.

Belles-Lettres, Classical, and Philological.

Poems by Robert Buchanan. 12mo., pp. 311. Boston: Roberts & Brothers. 1866.

Mr. Buchanan is accepted by the age as a veritable poet. He is endowed with a variety of powers, and flings out a variety of styles. At first we thought him a Keats risen from his Italian grave to tell the world that he could not be killed by a Quarterly

reviewer. Then he is a Shelley, with his affluence of brilliant imagery, his perfect riot in the most exquisite verbiage, his mysticism without his pantheism, playing with language with a mastery that detects new powers in an English vocabulary. Then he tells a graphic tale in plain bald prosaic verse, more homely and not less powerful than Crabbe. But then he is no mere mocking-bird; he has a throat and a gamut of his own, and plays you all sorts of *ad libitum* variations and voluntaries.

The volume consists of UNDERTONES, most of which are very highly toned; and IDYLS which it is very idle to style idyls, unless you would make an idol of the sweet Greek name that means something quite different from its present use. We like the Undertones better than the Idyls. They play mostly upon classic themes, and, with all his very modern spirit, Buchanan has a deep Greeklike impregnation to him. We wish our room permitted quoting the "Swan-song of Apollo."

We cannot dally with these poets. Ours is a prose life. They are mostly seducing liars; and we have as much to do with the truth as life suffices. But for those who have time, and who are greatly liable to waste it on matters more questionable, and who love to be magnetized with brilliant fancies and resonant melodies, Buchanan has a large amount of such witchcraft in him.

An Introductory Latin Book, intended as an Elementary Drill Book on the Inflections and Principles of the Language, and as an Introduction to the Author's Grammar, Reader, and Latin Composition. By A. HARKNESS, Professor in Brown University. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

A Latin Reader, intended as a Companion to the Author's Latin Grammar. With References, Suggestions, Notes, and Vocabulary. By A. HARKNESS, Professor in Brown University. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The first of these books is emphatically a "drill book," and as such is admirably done. Its grammatical principles and paradigms are transferred directly, in form, language, and numbering, from the author's grammar, which has won high praise for its clear arrangement and philosophical scholarship. This feature will be a very great advantage to those who pass from the Introductory to the grammar. Copious double translation exercises accompany the rules and paradigms from the very first, giving the learner an opportunity to enjoy the practice and theory together. The "suggestions" to the learner, though brief, are valuable, and the constant references will keep the memory fresh on principles already learned. The whole is a most judicious

selection of elementary work, arranged in a way to secure for the pupil a thorough foundation in the knowledge of the language.

The Latin Reader is adapted to the author's grammar. The exercises of the first part are designed to illustrate the grammar. The selections of the second part illustrate connected discourses. Abundant references clear the track of all grammatical difficulties, while the suggestions to the learner, notes, and models for parsing, furnish needed assistance in a happy manner. Teachers will welcome both these books. H.

Periodicals.

The Sunday-School Journal. D. WISE, D.D., Editor.

There are thousands throughout our Church who teach our Sunday classes, but who shall teach the teachers? Who shall inspire, suggest, and inform the minds through our length and breadth, that are to inspire the soul of the child? We know no man who can do it so well as Dr. Wise, and no one method of imparting the instruction to that numerous class that are instructing all the other classes, as this noble instrument, *The Sunday-School Journal.* When it first began it was a plain unpromising looking sheet; but as it now emerges from the press, it vies with any other Sunday-school banner extant.

And how shall our young folks be incited to engaging in the great work of Sunday-school instruction? We have had many a fine enthusiast who has made the Sunday-school his noble hobby; and many an intuitive adept in the art of teaching. Some have gone to their reward; more, whom we could name with honor, are still living and in the field, and more still should be entering. But how shall the vacated places and the vacant ranks be filled? Of ways there is at any rate one. With his JOURNAL our faithful editor can summon fresh successors, as father Abraham did his three hundred thousand volunteers. They may not all come at once; but the trumpet in the summoner's hands is perpetually sounding, and the volunteers will come by units and anon swell to the thousands. So may one of the most pressing wants of the Church be supplied.

Our entire Sunday-school literature has, under its present administration, been within a few years past entirely renovated. It acknowledges no superior either in quality, variety, or cheapness. A corps of writers has been carefully selected, and a

"childhood literature" of the true caliber has been created. It nobly meets the demands of the Church. Still our schools are most defective: our system needs a great improving; our army, discipline and a greater efficiency. It is matter of congratulation that so able a lieutenant as Mr. VINCENT has been called into a field so wide and full of fruitful labor. Though Methodism must never abandon her aggressive work in the outside world, her Sunday-schools, if rightly managed, ought to insure her reproduction of herself on a larger scale, and with improved material, from generation to generation. In the light of these facts we have no more important periodical in the Church than our Sunday-School Journal. Every superintendent should see that it reaches every teacher, and every young person who should be a teacher.

Pamphlets.

The Christian Recorder, Volume VI. Philadelphia: 1866.

This is the organ of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, edited by the Rev. James Lynch, a graduate of Oberlin, a gentleman of eminent ability, destined, we trust, to lead a distinguished career in the promotion of the interests of our Afric-American brethren. The paper, thus ably conducted, we are sorry to note, is not munificently sustained. In no way can this class of our countrymen so serve their common interests as by maintaining the reputation they have so largely of late acquired by an earnest zeal in behalf of intellectual and moral improvement. An able periodical, nobly sustained, is one of the most efficient of all means, both for advancing the culture and evincing that advancement to the world. Its failure, or even want of due success, would be a catastrophe to their cause.

We have had occasion to remark, that during the successive trying stages of our national crisis, of all sides and parties, the negro is the only man who has *always* behaved himself well. He neither engaged in servile insurrection, nor "precipitated" any secession. He bided quietly his time, only praying the Father on high that it might speedily come; and terrible on the oppressor has been the return shower of that ascending prayer. When the war came, a number of negroes met in a room on Broadway to agree upon offering their services to the government; but (such was the wisdom that ruled the hour) a body of police were sent up to disperse their meeting; and this was done, not under the

presidency of James Buchanan, but of Abraham Lincoln! Negro bided quietly his time. He only as a stealthy "contraband" gave intelligence to our armies, lent relief to our wounded, and aided our imprisoned soldiers in their escapes. But when came the *hour*, then came the *man*. He came to the battle front to give pledge, with the blood of his manhood, for the manhood of his blood. His fiery onset silenced for ever the cowardice that had dared to call him a coward, while the bloody massacre of Fort Pillow has bidden the nation to vow that, whoever shall rule the South, his wrongs shall be righted. Other motives, of a more general and more purely Christian philanthropy, urge the Christian North to place her treasures and her men into the work of elevating the colored loyalty of the South. But there could be no trueness in the heart of the North if she did not feel bound, as by a heaven-registered oath, to see to it that a race so displaying, in the trying hour, the highest qualities of manhood, should be allowed the fullest rights of manhood; and that so tried a loyalty in the country's peril should be endowed with all the franchises, and with all the means of qualifying for those franchises, that the country can bestow.

But one sad mistake, if we understand, have we known our Methodist Afric-American brethren commit. We do not specially object to any compliments paid by them to the Southern General Conference, so far as they were true. We do not presume, with our amount of knowledge, to say how far the actual compliments were true. But the bitter and caluminous onslaught the colored delegates opened upon the Methodist Episcopal Church was a mistake of the most unfortunate and most inexcusable kind. Such a calumny upon the Church that has by all acknowledgement led the van for the attainment of their deliverance from slavery! Such an offering of incense presented to the nostrils of men who had fought a life-long battle to perpetuate their enslavement! How have we rejoiced that our pro-slavery politicians have not got hold of the fact. How quickly would they have exclaimed, "Just as we said. These imbecile niggers are completely under the thumb of their old whippers. Give them a vote, and they will use it at their old masters' bidding against their enfranchisers." It was not we who suffered from that slavishly-uttered calumny, but those who uttered it. They were false, not so much to our reputation, as to their own color. They were untrue to their own race. They abdicated the manhood that their martyred brothers had attested with their blood.

Doubtless it is true that by our Church, as by all other parts of our community, the colored race has been wronged. But what

is the fountain-head of all that wrong? Slavery. Who has insisted that that wrong should be intense, persistent, and accumulated in the North as well as in the South? The slave-power and its northern allies and abettors. Trampling on the northern negro has been the tribute the North has paid to the slave-holding South. The northern negro has been insulted, crushed, outlawed, because he was own brother and one with the southern slave; and because the oppressor of that slave required that the North should oppress the slave's brother. To break the chain of the southern slaveholder was the first step to breaking the rod of the northern oppressor. That chain, thank God! we have broken. And so we say that the colored man that stands up before a southern assembly to belie his emancipators, is untrue to every drop of blood in his own veins.

We are well aware of the disapprobation of a large share of the African M. E. Church of that procedure. Many, and we think the most thoughtful of that Church, would prefer even a union with our Church, could it be so attained as to produce no collisions and jealousies by injudicious contact, and so as to secure the ample aids of the stronger Church, without overawing or checking the free development of the weaker. Perhaps such a union (as foreshadowed by Dr. Crary) is practicable; and if practicable, desirable. It is not mere *color* that produces any obstacle. Our southern white brethren are ample proof that (at any rate where one color is enslaved,) the utmost personal familiarity and the closest personal contact can be the normal rule. The southern defenders of slavery have often described in sentimental style the intimate and tender relation between master and slave. Master has been nursed in negro arms, and has been fondled and waited upon, all his days, by colored domestics. Nay, he has been the parent, perhaps, of a numerous dusky progeny. It is only at contact with the *free* colored man, as fellow-minister, or fellow-voter, or fellow-legislator, that he feels shocked as by an electric battery! But with us Northerners it is only the transient absence of that culture, for which the means have been denied them, which renders entire organic association a matter of time. Did sufficient reasons require a well qualified Afric-American bishop to be elected, and preside in turn over our General Conference, who would object from mere color alone? A few years ago the objection, in obedience to southern influences, would have been very unanimous. A few years hence, we trust, it will be wondered that such objection could ever have existed.

Centenary Pictorial Album. Being Contributions of the Early History of Methodism in the State of Maryland. By GEORGE C. M. ROBERTS, M.D., D.D. Quarto, cloth and gold, pp. 30. Baltimore: J. W. Woods. 1866.

Dr. Roberts has here furnished the only centenary pictorial which would appear well upon the parlor table. Most of the special groups we have yet seen would give to our posterity the notion that either the fine arts or the human face were not quite developed in our day. The selections for engraving are out of the routine of bishops and other officials. We have indeed Asbury in his episcopal young manhood, the plain but noble face of Asbury's mother, the live looking young Strawbridge, with his embowered log chapel, and the house of his death and funeral, and his forest grave. Then we have Henry Willis's grave, and the right noble face and form of Mrs. Willis. Historical "Old Light-street" is present in a variety of lights, followed by the powerful personality of the elder Dr. Roberts. We thank our Maryland friends for these fresh illustrations of their ancient classic Methodist grounds. Lovers of our history in every quarter of the Church should be sure not to overlook this special *souvenir*.

Miscellaneous.

The Draytons and the Davenants. A Story of the Civil Wars. By the Author of the "Schonberg-Cotta Family," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 509. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1866.

The Brewer's Family. By MRS. ELLIS, Author of "Women of England." 12mo., pp. 325. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1866.

Passages in the Life of the Faire Gospeller, Mistress Anne Askew. Recounted by ye unworthie pen of NICHOLAS MOLDWARP, B.A., and now first set forth by the Author of "Mary Powell." New York: M. W. Dodd. 1866.

The Brownings: A Tale of the Great Rebellion. By J. G. FULLER, Author of "The Grahams," etc. 12mo., pp. 310. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1866.

The above four volumes, moral fictions connected with the history of England or America, are the productions of authors eminent and excellent in this department of literature, and appear in Mr. Dodd's best style.

Drops of Water from Many Fountains. By MIRA ELDRIDGE. 24mo., pp. 216. New York: Foster & Palmer. 1867.

The Methodist Almanac for the Year of our Lord 1867. Being the Ninety-first Year of American Independence, and the Hundred and first of American Methodism. 12mo., pp. 53. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Sanctuary: A Story of the Civil War. By GEORGE WARD NICHOLS, Author of "The Story of the Great March." With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 286. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866.

PLAN OF EPISCOPAL VISITATION—1867.

Conference.	Place.	Time.	Bishop.
Mississippi	First Church, New Orleans.	Dec. 13, 1866	Thomson.
Virginia and North Carolina	Place to be fixed	Jan. †3, 1867	Scott.
Texas	Houston	" †3	Thomson.
Baltimore	City Station, Baltimore	Feb. 27	Kingsley.
Kentucky	Lexington	" 27	Thomson.
Missouri and Arkansas	Independence, Missouri	March 6	Ames.
Washington	Sharp-street, Baltimore	" 6	Simpson.
Pittsburgh	Massillon, Ohio	" 6	Thomson.
East Baltimore	Frederick City	" 6	Kingsley.
Philadelphia	Locust-street, Harrisburgh	" 13	Scott.
Kansas	Manhattan	" 13	Ames.
West Virginia	Catlettsburgh, Ky	" †14	Thomson.
New Jersey	Keyport	" 20	Janes.
Newark	St. Paul, Staten Island	" 20	Simpson.
Providence	Providence, R. I.	" 27	Baker.
New England	Waltham, Mass	" 27	Scott.
Nebraska	Omaha	" 27	Ames.
South Carolina	Charleston, S. C.	April 1	Baker.
New York	Beaford-street, New York	" 8	Janes.
New York East	St. John-street, New Haven	" 8	Clark.
North Indiana	Anderson	" 10	Ames.
New Hampshire	Manchester	" 10	Kingsley.
Eastern German	Newark, N. J.	" 10	Simpson.
Troy	Pittsfield, Mass	" 17	Clark.
Oneida	Utica	" 17	Kingsley.
Wyoming	Hyde Park, Pa	" 17	Simpson.
Vermont	Place not given*	" 17	Scott.
Black River	Syracuse	" †18	Janes.
Maine	Bath	May 15	Scott.
East Maine	Wiscasset	" 15	Clark.
Germany and Switzerland	Zurich	June †13	Ames.
Colorado	Colorado City	" †20	Simpson.
Erie	Newcastle, Pa.	July 10	Janes.
Delaware	Chestertown, Md.	" 24	Janes.
Oregon	Portland	Aug. 7	Thomson.
Cincinnati	Urbana	" 28	Morris. Kingsley.
North Ohio	Tiffin	" 28	Clark.
Central Ohio	Fostoria	" 28	Scott.
East Genesee	Hornellsville	" 28	Baker.
Detroit	Saginaw City	Sept. 4	Janes.
Nevada	Carson City	" †5	Thomson.
Central German	Toledo, Ohio	" †5	Kingsley.
West Wisconsin	Prairie du Chien	" †5	Simpson.
Central Illinois	Monmouth	" †5	Ames.
Indiana	Wesley Chapel, Indianapolis	" 11	Morris. Ames.
Southeast Indiana	Connersville	" 11	Scott.
Northwest Indiana	Danville	" 11	Janes.
Michigan	Lansing	" 11	Clark.
Northwest Wisconsin	Sparta	" †12	Simpson.
Iowa	Ottumwa	" 18	Scott.
Minnesota	Rochester	" 18	Simpson.
Upper Iowa	Anamosa	" 18	Janes.
California	Santa Clara	" 18	Thomson.
Illinois	Champaign City	" 18	Kingsley.
Des Moines	Fifth-street, Des Moines	" †19	Clark.
Southern Illinois	Litchfield	" 25	Ames.
Northwest German	St. Paul, Minn	" †26	Simpson.
Southwest German	Belleville, Ill	" †26	Scott.
Rock River	Dixon	Oct. 2	Scott.
Wisconsin	Beaver Dam	" 2	Janes.
Ohio	Spencer Chapel, Ironton	" 2	Ames.
Genesee	Leroy, N. Y.	" 2	Baker.
Tennessee	Shelbyville	" †3	Clark.
Holston	Knoxville, Tenn	" †3	Kingsley.
Western Georgia and Alabama	Place to be fixed	" †10	Clark.
India Mission Conference	Place not given	1867. Jan. 10	.....
Liberia Mission Conference	Place not given	" " 23	Roberts.

* To be fixed by the presiding elders.

† Thursday.

5 7/8 x 9

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1867.

Art. I.—INDIA.

That immense triangle stretching from the Himmalayas to Cape Comorin, a distance of nineteen hundred miles, and from the Hindoo Coosh on the west to the borders of Burmah on the east, a distance of fifteen hundred, is, in many respects, the grandest peninsula on earth. It has an area of 1,446,576 square miles, and is much larger than France, Great Britain, Austria, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Denmark, Greece, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Turkey, Prussia, and the Ionian Republic, united.

It is divided by the Vindhya mountains into Hindustan and the Deccan, each of which has a table-land and plains. The table-land of the former is supported on the south by the Vindhya range, and on the north by a lower one in the Bundlecund, sloping gradually into the basin of the Ganges. The table-land of the Deccan, fifteen hundred feet above the sea level, is supported on the north by the Vindhya, and on the other three sides by the Ghauts, which run round the peninsula near the coast, leaving low plains between their bases and the sea. The Nerbuddah river forms the dividing line between the two table-lands; the Warda marks the southern boundary of a woody tract which is peopled by aboriginal tribes; the Godavery flows through a valley that might supply the world with sugar; the Indus makes an Egypt in the northwest. Eastward of this stream, and westward of the Aravalli chain, lies a desert, with here and there an oasis. Between the Himmalaya and

the Vindhya ranges is the plane of the Ganges, with the Punjab at its head and Bengal at its foot, the latter of which seems to be the united gift of the Ganges and the Burrampootra. This great peninsula is walled in on the north by the snowy range of the Himmalaya, and protected both on the east and west by mountain chains; and although it has gates alike on the east, the northwest, and the west, through which the Affghan, the Tartar, and the Persian invasions have at different periods poured upon the plains below, yet with the instruments and science of modern warfare these passes may readily be guarded.

Off its southern extremity lies the fragrant island of Ceylon, sustaining the same relation to India that Sicily does to Italy.

This fair land, extending from the eighth parallel of north latitude to the thirty-sixth, furnishes almost every vegetable, animal, and mineral product. Cereals abound in the plains, gems in the mountains, spices in the breeze; tea in Assam, coffee in the Nilgherry Hills, indigo in Bengal, and opium and jute in the basin of the Ganges. As to cotton and sugar, they are both indigenous to India, which, under improved methods of cultivation and of intercommunication, and a wise government, could stock the markets of the world with both commodities.

Although the *manufactures* of India, through want of proper encouragement, have declined, yet its muslins and works in the precious metals are still unrivaled, as well for their texture as their beauty.

The *population* of India is thus estimated:

British territory in India	131,990,901
Native " "	48,376,247
French and Portuguese	517,149
Total	180,884,297

Dwell for a moment upon these figures. Suppose Providence take India from Great Britain, and, as a compensation, give her all the rest of Asia, the Chinese empire alone excepted. Would she gain or lose as to the number of her subjects? Let us see. Arabia, with its celebrated deserts and mountains, and famed cities and unconquered tribes, contains eight millions. Asiatic Turkey, land of the Bible, the primitive seat of civili-

zation, the scene of great victories and seat of great monarchies, ten millions; Georgia, two; Persia, nine; Affghanistan, six; Beeloochistan, one; Independent Tartary, seven; Siberia, stretching from sea to sea, three; Farther India, including Burmah, the kingdom of Siam, the empire of Anam, Cochin China, and Malacca, twenty millions; the Japan empire, thirty. Add these together, and you have not much more than half the population of India. Set down now, in addition, Thibet, and Chinese Tartary, and Corea, and all other parts of the Chinese empire except China proper, say thirty-four millions, and you have one hundred and thirty millions. Next throw in Borneo, Sumatra, Java, the Phillipine Isles, Celebes, Spice Islands, Floris, Timor—all Malaysia; next Australia, New Guinea, New Zealand, Van Dieman's Land, Louisiade, New Britain—all Australasia; then the Sandwich Islands, Society Islands, the Ladrone Islands—all Polynesia; in fine, Oceanica, one whole quarter of the globe, and you only raise the number to one hundred and fifty-six millions; still thirty-four millions short of the population of India.

Take another view. The Barbary States, Belud ul Gered, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, Sahara, Soudan, Eastern Africa, Western Africa, Ethiopia, and the African Islands, all contain, according to our books generally, but sixty-two millions. To the population of Africa add that of Greenland, Iceland, British America, Russian America, Mexico, the United States, Central America, the West Indies, Bermudas, Brazil, Argentine Republic, New Grenada, Peru, Bolivia, Venezuela, Patagonia, Equador, Chili, Guiana, Uraguay, Paraguay, and the Falkland Islands, in fine, the whole continent of America, seventy millions in all, and you have only one hundred and thirty millions, more than fifty millions short of the population of India. Add to the people of both these continents those of Oceanica, and you raise the number to only one hundred and fifty-four millions, thirty millions less than India.

This people are of different origins, customs, and faiths, and speak various languages, not less than twenty-nine, twenty-four of them derived from the Sanscrit, and five from other sources. They have much knowledge, and a wonderful history. India's astronomy dates fifteen centuries before Christ, and long ere the mind of the Mediterranean awoke. Her trigo-

nometry was a thousand years in advance of that of Europe. Her logic and philosophy preceded and inspired those of Greece. The fascinating Pantheism which Germany elaborates, and England servilely echoes, and Emerson discourses as if it were a new discovery, has been proclaimed for two or three thousand years among a people to enlighten whose darkened minds Berlin and London and Boston send missionaries, and many a dirty devotee expounds it more adroitly, ay, and eloquently too, than either.

The intellect of India is still the speculative mind of the East, sustaining the same relation to Asia that Greece does to ancient Europe, and Germany to modern. The Hindoos, a people of Causasian origin, and of Indo-Germanic family, entering India through the Hindoo Coosh, three thousand years ago, and gradually spreading over the country, enslaving or driving to the southern mountains the aboriginal inhabitants, introduced Brahminism. This is a magnificent polytheism, systematic in form, with power to modify science, mould art, inspire literature, shape social life, sustain civil government, identify itself with nationality, and appeal to the strongest feelings of the native character, reverence for the past. Its hymns of devotion and formulas of worship, the Vedas, four in number, are older than the Psalms of David, strongly imbued with patriarchal theology, deemed eternal, and supposed to have been written in the language of the gods. The Shastras, six in number, contain some scientific treatises, and a cosmogony in many respects reminding us of the book of Genesis, though it divides eternity, and gives us eras of millions of years. It has a theology resting upon the triad Brama, Vishnu, and Shiva.

The language in which the sacred books are written (Sanscrit) is of unfathomable antiquity, and, according to Sir William Jones, more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more excellently refined than either; and, in the judgment of the learned, capable of expressing every movement of the human will, every form of human thought, and every wave of human passion, with unsurpassed clearness, elegance, and force.

The deities of Hindooism are generally worshiped in shapes in which they are supposed to have become incarnate. The

popular theology is founded upon the code of Menu and the Puranas. The latter, eighteen in number, is a collection of legends concerning the gods, who marry, quarrel, sin, and suffer, and are thirty millions strong.

There is a striking resemblance between the earlier mythology of India and that of ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome. Thus Brama corresponds to the Ammon of the Egyptians, the Zeus of the Greeks, the Jupiter of the Romans; Saraswati to the Neith of Egypt, the Athena of Greece, the Minerva of Rome; Cama to Cupid; Chrishna with the Gopias dancing around him, to Apollo and the Muses; Rama to the Osiris of Egypt and the Bacchus of Greece. Shiva in India becomes Typho in Egypt, and Pluto in Greece; while the Isa of the first land is the Isis of the second, and the Diana of the third. Transmigration is modified in the west into Tartarus and the shades of Elysium, and absorption into the Deity into ascent to the gods. Both the East and the West believed that man had a prior existence, and they taught the doctrine of purification by punishment; but the Greeks, too busy with this world, postponed purgatory to the next; while the Hindoos preferred torture on this side the grave to Pluto and his fires on the other. The gods and myths of India were probably the originals of which those of the classic West were the copies. The latter are now known only to song, the former still live in the faith of the people. The types of Osiris and Bacchus, of Isis and Diana, are still worshiped under the shade of mango groves, and the descendant of the original bull Apis may be seen in every Hindoo city, and under the shadow of every temple of Shiva. Whether Indian mythology is older or not, it is superior to the European. While the Grecian gods become incarnate for purposes of lust, prejudice, or passion, those of India come in flesh for purposes of benevolence. Is Vishnu a fish? it is to rescue truth from a demon, or humanity from the deluge. Is he a tortoise? It is to sustain the earth when sinking in the ocean. Is he a boar? It is to draw forth upon his tusks the land that had been submerged. Is he a lion, bursting from the marble column? It is to save a pious son from the hands of a blaspheming monarch. Is he a dwarf? It is to serve the gods. Is he a warrior? It is to destroy oppressors. Does he become Ram? It is to overcome Ra-

vanna and liberate Ceylon. Does he appear as Krishnu? It is to slay monsters and demons, and abound in benefactions. Is he a Bhudda? It is to counteract perverted power. In his future incarnation, Kalki, he is to come on a white horse to restore pure religion, punish the impenitent, and bring back the golden age.

The substance of these mythologies is the same, whether modified by the gloomy mind of India, the heavy one of Egypt, the cheerful one of Greece, or the stately and steady one of Rome; and this substance is evidently of higher antiquity than any, a primitive revelation. The existence of God, the garden of Eden, the fall of man, a future state, an incarnation, a possibility of reunion with God, the certainty of punishment, and the doctrine of substitution, may be traced through them all, but perverted and obscured. The Supreme Being is often exhibited without attributes, the void. Depravity is from the evil nature of matter; the future state is substituted by transmigration; and pardon and purification are sought by ceremonies, contemplation, self-torture, and presents to priests. The ancient mythologies are the solid gold of truth beaten into flimsy tinsel and moulded by a depraved imagination into forms which dazzle and bewilder, but are no longer capable of being the current coin of the moral universe or bearing the image of its Maker.

This history of Indian idolatry, and indeed of all, shows that when men forsake revelation their minds grow darker and darker. There is an awful descent from the Vedas to the Institutes of Menu, and a still greater from these to the Puranas.

The greater permanence of Indian religion is due, in great measure, to the fact that while the spiritual ideas of Greece and Rome assumed the fascinating but perishable forms of statuary and painting, those of India took the enduring form of books. The original volumes, however, being in a language unknown to the common people, are, so far as they are concerned, dead.

The living and degenerated faith has defiled the whole literature of the land. I once asked why native ladies were not educated. The answer was, "There is no literature in the language fit for a lady to read." The common thoughts and conversation of the people are defiled. You could not repeat

in a Christian land the language of the children in their sports or quarrels, without mantling the cheek of every woman and provoking the hootings of every man that heard you.

The apostle Paul meant what he said when, speaking of the converted heathen, he cried, "And such were some of you, but ye are washed." The heathen need washing, not merely their feet and hands, but their mouths. Nor is this surprising when we consider their god and myths, or even their temples. It is creditable to the modesty of Indian women that they visit the temples at night, and pay their devotions to the chief object of their worship in silence and darkness. How they pass the streets without blushing it is difficult to tell, for the public places are made odious by the objects of adoration set up within them. Behold the steps of descent. Beginning with the true God, they advanced to the triad, then multiplied their avatars, finally worshiped things inanimate, till now the waters, the sun, the monkey, even sometimes the gaspipes and telegraph poles, are worshiped, and the gods of the country are more numerous than the men, while the objects most adored are those that are most disgusting. Thus their mind and conscience is defiled, and, as in ancient Ephesus, "the Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart; who, being past feeling, have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness." Their general conduct is what we might expect, according to the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. They have indeed a standard of morality, falling below which one is condemned, for "when the Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." Indeed, without this no business could be carried on, and no community exist. Hence, when the dhooly bearer receives his charge he takes the same care of it that a Christian would. But beyond the outward act it is to be feared the morality of Hindoos rarely goes. Little do they feel love to God or to man, or the spirit which the angels expressed at the birth of Jesus.

The institutions of Hindooism illustrate its character. Prominent among these is caste. The code of Menu divides

society into four castes, the priest, the soldier, the husbandman, and the servant. The first was said to proceed from the mouth of Brama, the second from his arms, the third from his thighs, and the fourth from his feet. These have almost disappeared except the first. The Brahmins, from ten to twelve millions, still, by monopoly of knowledge, maintain their position at the head of the social edifice, beneath which there are now numerous castes, varying from sixty to a hundred and seventy, according to locality.

How a system so utterly at war with fundamental political and gospel principles could prevail for two thousand five hundred years is amazing, unless you consider that it is rooted in the popular religion, is deemed the divine order, and confers immunities on the lower castes in proportion to their descent in the social scale. The Brahmin is in perpetual danger of losing caste, for if he but touch a mater's button he is defiled. The tenacity with which caste is held is wonderful. A Fakeer, on being imprisoned, determined to starve himself to death, and die with a curse upon the magistrate upon his lips. When he was nearly gone, the jailer read to him an order that he should, when a corpse, be wrapped in an ox-hide, carried out by men of low caste, and buried in the earth; he immediately said, "Give me food, or I lose my caste." At Jyepore, in Rajpootana, a bazar that could not be cleared with police or artillery was at once cleared by some sweepers with brooms. Sir John Lawrence, who attributes the Sepoy rebellion to the greased cartridges, related to me this story: On a field of battle an officer and a Sepoy lay side by side, wounded and suffering, in the hot sun. All day the Indian said nothing but "Water! water!" Toward night a woman came with a skin of water. The Englishman drank and was refreshed. The Sepoy asked the woman of what caste she was, and being informed that she was of low caste, he turned away his parched lips. The officer remonstrated, "You and I only are present. I pledge my honor as a soldier never to mention it. Drink, and you may live; refuse, and you die." "No," said he, "better die than lose my caste." If the Sepoy were a Brahmin, we may cease to wonder when we reflect that, according to the code of Menu, whatever exists in the universe is all in effect, though not in form, the wealth of the Brahmin, since he is

entitled to it by his primogeniture and eminence in rank. To him knowledge is shut up, for the sacred books are too holy to be studied by any but a Brahmin, or even to be read by a Soodra. He who mentions a Brahmin with contumely should have an iron style, ten fingers long, thrust red hot into his mouth.

Some, perhaps, may tell us that somèthing exactly like this exists in this country, and that if we substitute a certain word for Brahmin, and a certain other for Soodra, we shall find here an unwritten code of the same spirit as that of Menu. I am aware that customs and feelings akin to caste may be found in the Christian world, as when a man is compelled to follow the trade of his father, or a people are doomed to inferiority in consequence of their color. But mark the difference: these things are *in defiance of Christianity.*

Kindred to caste is slavery, which has existed from time immemorial in India, and which, despite British law, exists there to this day, and to such an extent that there is scarcely a rajah or wealthy native family that has not its slaves. Mark, this is in accordance with the native religion; but where it exists in Christian lands it is contrary to conscience and faith, and destined, with the cultivation of the one and the progress of the other, to utter extermination. Suttee, the burning of the woman upon the funeral pile, was often done against her own remonstrance, and by means of her own children binding her to the flames. Infanticide is still practiced by the Rajpoots and Catties, in order to avoid the expense of marrying their daughters, and it is authorized by the sacrifices to the river god Gunga.

More terrible still is the practice of Thuggee—a system of hereditary murder, carried on by a fraternity spread all over India, having secret signs and a peculiar dialect, who are taught from boyhood to look upon murder by the noose as their calling. We have bands of robbers, counterfeiters, murderers, in Christian lands; but note the difference. The Thug is religiously inducted by his spiritual guide; he uses an instrument consecrated by religious solemnities. He worships Kali, a murderous goddess, who has given him the privilege of killing his fellow-beings for a livelihood, to whom after every murder he makes an offering of silver and of sugar, whose wrath he

would incur if he failed, when the omens were favorable, to suffocate the victim, and whose name is so venerable with the people that the native rulers are afraid to deal with her murderers. Similar to this is the system of Dekoitee, practiced religiously by a set of robber castes.

These are *legitimate* moral results of Brahmanism. I need not speak of polygamy, nor of the degradation of woman, nor of the monasticism and devoteeism so prevalent. The priests are often celibates and mendicants. The fakeers are numerous. Some holding their hands clenched until the nails pass through the skin, others suspending themselves by hooks, others rolling themselves across the country, measuring hundreds of miles with their bodies. I have seen the devotee on the banks of the Ganges, almost nude, covered with ashes, occupying a constrained position, with his joints apparently in a state of auchylosis, yet receiving the adoration of the people. A missionary had traveled all day in the beautiful valley of the Nabuddah, charmed with the mountain and the stream, when toward night he came across a devotee who had been occupying a cave for forty years, worshiping a god that he had made with his own hands out of cow-dung.

The priests profess to worship not the idol, but God in the idol, as they pay homage to the queen in the person of the viceroy. They, however, seem to have no knowledge of the Infinite Being, who, they say, is incomprehensible to finite minds, and to whom, in all India, there is neither priest nor temple. The philosophers are generally pantheists, and teach either that both matter and spirit are manifestations of Brahm, or that Brahm is the only existence, and creation an illusion, or that matter is eternal, and Brahm, uniting himself with it, gives it life. Each system confounds God and the creature, and destroys all moral distinctions. The Vedants when asked who is God will generally point to themselves. They allege that if men lie or murder, it is not they, but God in them, that is chargeable. The common people do not reason much, but bow credulously before the idol.

India gave birth to another idolatrous system, Buddhism, which originated with Sakya Mooni six hundred years before Christ. It is full of absurdities and false philosophy. It teaches the doctrine of transmigration, embraces no idea of for-

giveness, asserts that punishment follows transgression as the cart wheel follows the ox, enjoins the building of monasteries and temples, and the making and worshiping of gods, which deeds will elevate us to pleasant spheres where we may eat fruits and gather flowers reared by the hands of angels. It is, however, atheistic, and teaches that all things end in annihilation. Rejecting caste, it provoked the opposition of Brahminism, and after a long and fearful conflict it was driven out of India. It took refuge, however, in the island of Ceylon, the slopes of the Himalayas and the table-land beyond, gradually spread along the eastern shores of the Bay of Bengal, and finally took root in China and Japan. It is now the faith of three hundred millions of the human race. It is seen in India now in a modified form called Jainism, which embraces caste. The number of Buddhists under the British government must be many millions, as the people of British Burmah, Ceylon, and Tennasserim are chiefly of that faith. Another great heresy, Mohammedism, has also a strong hold in India. The false prophet had scarcely been in his grave fifty years, before the Arabian cavalry was reined up on the banks of the Chenaub. Mahmoud of Ghuznee conquered Guzerat and the Punjab; Arabs and Abyssinians formed settlements upon the coast; Tamerlane sacked Delhi, and his descendants founded the Mohammedan dynasty of the great Mogul. Persian and Affghan invasions of Mussulmans from the west, and of Tartars from the north, have also been seen, and rarely rolled back, from the Indian plains.

Of Mohammedism we need say but little. The Koran borrows facts and principles from the Bible, but incorporates with them fables and errors. It admits the truth that there is one God, but perverts it by representing him as equally the author of sin and holiness; it teaches a gloomy fatalism, and puts the Hadees or traditions before the Koran. Its moral code is cruel and bloody, and allows both slavery and polygamy; its worship consists of external ceremonies; it is without any plan of propitiation or pardon, and it holds out to the believer a paradise of carnal delights. The results of the system are terrible. I expected to find the Mohammedans more upright than the Pagans, inasmuch as their creed is better; but I was assured by credible testimony that they are more profligate, licentious,

and cruel than their heathen neighbors, and they have introduced forms of sin into India too shameless to be named, though they are alluded to in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and described in some of the Grecian and Italian classics.

The Mussulman population of India is probably twenty-seven millions; among these, all the sects of that faith, Shiis, Sunnies, and Wahabees. In the shadow of these colossal forms of error you find various offshoots, such as the Sikh faith, and among the aboriginal inhabitants, idolaters who have not yet abandoned human sacrifices.

When mankind were dispersed, the most populous and enterprising tribes moved eastward; thither was the path of empire. On the Euphrates, or beyond, arose the Assyrian, Babylonian, and other great kingdoms, and even before they arose the children of Noah had probably founded on the banks of the Hoang Ho the great empire of China. Arts and arms seemed to be the inheritance of Shem and Ham, and to find their first theaters in Asia or Africa. After a time the tents of Japheth began to grow powerful, and the scepter of the world to be transferred to the basin of the Mediterranean.

When our Lord ascended and gave gifts to men, he taught his disciples that his empire was universal, and, sending them forth into all the world, he exhibited to them in millennial vision the North, the South, the East, and the West sitting down together in the kingdom of God. They obeyed his command. While some went north, others south, and others west, a few penetrated the denser and darker populations of the East. But upon the sun-worshipers of Persia, and the philosophic pagans of India and China, they seem to have made little or no impression. Turn to the map of the countries traveled by the apostles, as the historian has traced it, and you will observe that it does not extend eastward of the Orontes. Westward from Calvary has been the march of Christianity, through Asia Minor, around the Ægean, over the classic soil of Greece and Macedonia, and the peninsula of Italy, and still westward through Spain, Gaul, Scandinavia, Great Britain, and still westward over North and South America.

Account for it as we may, the East has stubbornly rejected the word of life. Neither the idolatrous systems of classic Rome and Greece, which had no Bible, nor the rude superstí-

tions of Gaul and Goth, and Celt and Briton, whose divinities were local, nor the fetishism of Africa, nor the spirit-worship of aboriginal America, has presented such formidable obstacles to the religion of Christ as are found in the lands of the East.

There stand Brahminism, Buddhism, Mohammedism, systems in which philosophy and superstition, priestcraft and kingcraft, have combined their powers to rule the human mind, and which stand like moral Himmalayas, shutting a large majority of the human race from the light of the Sun of righteousness.

Although in the days of John the Revelator the eastern nations contained the bulk of mankind, as they have done ever since, yet they are not once named in the Apocalypse.

The reason is apparent. The Bible gives no account of nations but as they are connected with the Church; and God, foreseeing that the peoples of the East would resist the truth until they were finally put into the power and under the tutelage of Christian rulers, saw also that their history, so far as connected with the history of redemption, would be a part of that of the western powers. God governs nations as we govern men. He uses moral means first, then physical. He will give to his Church the heritage of the heathen, if not by mercy, then by power. When he set up his king upon his holy hill of Zion, he declared the decree, and threatened to break those nations to pieces that disregarded it. When the Jews crucified Messiah, destruction fell alike upon their city, temple, and nation. So Roman emperors went down one after another until a Christian ascended the imperial throne. God bare long with the lands of the East, but he has at length taken them in hand.

Russian guns upon the banks of the Amoor, English and French at the gates of Pekin, have broken down the walls which so long barred China from the rest of the world. The thunders of artillery have also opened the way through the empire of Japan, not only for commerce, but for science and religion. By being brought within the range of cannon, Australia and the islands of the sea have been brought within the range of truth. But the most remarkable instance in which God has broken nations like a potter's vessel, is India, that land in which, as a focal point, the three colossal systems of religious error converge and radiate.

Nothing in history more wonderful than that a clerk in a factory should win one of the largest empires in the world; that a trading corporation should for so many years hold and acquire territory as did the East India Company; that, having failed to accomplish its purposes, it was overthrown by one of the bloodiest revolutions the world has ever seen; that such a revolution should be put down by a little island nine thousand miles distant; that it should prove to be the grandest step in India's progress; and that one hundred and eighty millions of Pagans should be easily and safely governed by eighty thousand Christian sabers. This is the Lord's doings, and it is marvelous in our eyes. None the less so because wicked men have accomplished the work, often from bad motives, and by unjustifiable means. God knows how to use bad men, and overrule bad motives and deplorable events, for the welfare of the world. Among angels, progress doubtless is through reason, and by the path of peace; but, owing to the perversity of man, national preservation and progress are by violence. What prevented Asiatic despotism from overspreading Europe? What prevented ancient Rome from becoming Punic? What saved medieval Germany and Gaul from becoming Mohammedan? What prevented the United States from being the great slave empire, and the propagandist of despotism in its worst form? Arms. The elements of our civilization—Greek culture, Roman law, Christian morals, Protestant faith, and political freedom—were all both procured and preserved by steel. What wonder, then, if God break down with a rod of iron those despotisms which for three thousand years have doomed the East to superstition, sluggishness, idolatry, and corruption, and prepare the peoples for a baptism of water by a baptism of blood.

Will the ascendancy of the British in India be permanent? Yes. How came they to put down the rebellion? The people were divided. The masses, long oppressed, cared nothing for the issue. Had they simply retired from their villages to the interior, carrying their effects with them, the British army must have starved to death by the roadside. But it was well supplied. Besides this division between the ruler and the ruled, there were others. The Bengali hates the Madrassee, both despise the natives of Bombay, all three look with jealousy

upon the hardier race of the northwest provinces, while the Sikhs and Ghoorkas have little respect for any of the rest, or they for them. Then there are religious divisions. Mohammedans and Brahmins can never unite. Though they joined in the mutiny with the watchword, "Two faiths in one saddle," the Brahmin soon perceived that the back seat was for him. The Mohammedans themselves are divided into Sunnites, Shiites, and Wahabees; and the Hindoos into nearly two hundred castes, and eighty-four thousand sects, whose interests are diverse. The intelligent rajahs perceive the advantages of English rule, and shudder at the anarchy and conflicts that would ensue from its overthrow. Meanwhile, while the natives are disarmed, the British have a controlling army and full possession of all the strongholds of the country, and are strengthened by perhaps twenty-five thousand European residents, and a hundred thousand Eurasians.

What will this power effect? Judge by what it has already effected. It has reduced anarchy to order, given law, established justice, protected the land from invasion, and prevented it from being ravaged by intestine wars. It has suppressed suttee and dekoitee, forbidden human sacrifices, repressed infanticide, and made slavery illegal. It has woven a network of telegraphs around the empire from Galle to Peshawur, and from Peshawur to Rangoon. It has established a regular system of postage for letters, papers, and books, at low charges and uniform rates. It has improved old roads and made new ones; sent steamers up the principal streams; constructed a canal nine hundred miles long, and will probably soon construct others in the valleys of the Mohanuddy, the Kistna, and the Godavery. It has commenced a system of railways embracing about five thousand miles of trunk lines, at a cost of nearly three thousand millions of dollars, which, when completed, will unite the extremes of the peninsula, open hitherto inaccessible tracts, and bring all parts close to each other and to the civilized world. Already the steam horse traverses the Gangetic valley from Calcutta to Delhi, crosses the peninsula from Madras to the western shore, and prances from Bombay to Nagpore.

It has steadily increased the trade of the country, which before the days of Clive could be conveyed in a single Venetian frigate, until it now reaches nearly five hundred millions

of dollars annually. It has raised the revenues of the government to two hundred and fifteen millions. It has given India the newspaper, that great educator, so that there are twenty-eight newspapers published weekly in Bengal, (three of them in English, by the natives,) thirty native presses in Madras, and I know not how many in Bombay and Ceylon, and twenty-five presses among the missions alone. It has established schools in all parts of the land, in which those sciences are taught that undermine the prevailing systems of superstition and error. It has made the English language classical in the country, and by this means it is furnishing the native mind with the rich and Christian stores of which that noble tongue is the medium. It has protected missionaries of Christ and their converts.

Since the mutiny eight or ten new missionary societies have entered India, bringing large additions to its evangelizing forces, so that in 1862, according to Dr. Mullins, there were in British India, including Burmah and Ceylon, 31 societies, working in 386 stations and 2,307 out-stations; 541 missionaries; 186 native missionaries; 1,776 catechists; 1,542 native churches; 49,688 communicants; 213,182 native Christians; 48,390 vernacular day-schools; 23,963 boys in Anglo-vernacular schools; 39,647 girls in day and boarding schools, showing an increase of over forty thousand Christians in ten years. Meanwhile the Bible has been translated into fourteen different languages of India, and circulated to the extent of 1,634,940 copies, and other Christian publications to that of 10,000,000.

Look, then, at this great peninsula, linked to the continent and the world by its languages, commerce, and religions: source of the false faiths which together ensnare six hundred millions of the human race, and the stronghold of a delusion that blinds a hundred and eighty millions more. This great moral pest-house, this Babel of devils, God has put into the power of one of the most enlightened Christian nations on earth. There are more Mohammedans under Victoria's scepter than under any other on earth. The Sultan has but twenty-one millions; she has twenty-five millions at least. There are more heathen under the same Christian queen than under any sovereign except the emperor of China. And this mass is all through and through, and more and more, subjected to Christian influences. The telegraphs are so many ganglia in a

great nervous system, diffusing new sensations; the railways are so many iron arteries, pumping Christian blood through the native veins; the newspapers are so many digestive powers, preparing healthful moral food; the schools are so many batteries, thundering at the crumbling battlements of error; the missions are so many brains, thinking new and better thoughts.*

Knowledge must be diffused through the earth. We know two things more, namely, that our religion can withstand modern science and make it tributary to itself, and that no other religion can; for every other faith has linked its science with its doctrines, so that they must both fall together. As to take Paris is to take France, and to take Sebastopol is to shake Russia to the Arctic seas, and to take Richmond is to shake out the rebels of the United States from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, so to Christianize India, owing to its key position in heathendom, is to shake out the idols from the face of the whole earth. Intellectual and moral power has both rights and responsibilities, and it is destined to rule the earth under the providence of God. Should Christian nations do for China what England has done for India, would not the people be wiser, better, happier? would not the boundaries of science, philosophy, and true religion be enlarged, and all the best interests of the world be promoted? Should the decrepit empire of the Sultan perish, and Great Britain receive Egypt and the Barbary States, France Asia Minor, and Russia European Turkey, who does not see that peoples long oppressed and darkened would be delivered, enlightened, raised to a higher and nobler civilization, brought into more intimate communion with mankind, and made to contribute immensely more to the wealth, the wisdom, and the worth of the world? They may do wrongs which may justify superior nations in exercising power over them; and if they give to them governments better adapted to their condition, and fitted to secure the protection of all their interests, let us bid them Godspeed.

We have entered upon a grand era. The Almighty is shaking the nations preparatory to giving them to his Son. The lines both of prophecy and providence converge at a point

* The annual expenditure for missions is $1,400,000, and the expenditure of the government for schools about the same.

which our feet are rapidly approaching. The child is in his cradle who may see a Joshua leading India into her spiritual Canaan. As the first thousand years brought the translation of Enoch, and the second the Flood, and the third the reign of David, and the fourth the Messiah, and the fifth the Reformation, so the sixth may bring the Millennium.

Art. II.—FAIRBAIRN ON PROPHECY.

Prophecy viewed in Respect to its Distinctive Nature, its Special Function, and Interpretation. By Patrick Fairbairn, D. D., Prof. Theol. in Free Church College, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1856. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

The common belief of the world has borne witness to the intrinsic probability of a supernatural revelation. The credentials of such probability are placed in prescience and power, manifested to men in the from of prophecy and miracle.

The nature of prophecy, with which only we are concerned in this article, involves something more than the prediction of events. This is its chief apologetic element, that from which is derived strong evidence on which rests the proof, in one form, that God has spoken in a supernatural way to mankind. But prophecy in its larger sense supposes any message from God, whether a prediction of coming events, a disclosure of an important truth, or the inculcation of an imperative duty. The proper conception of the true prophet is, that he is inspired of God to receive and utter the message delivered to him; but the mode of his inspiration is limited by the character of the subject communicated, and by what is required for the most effective impression on the minds of those to whom the communication is made. These general remarks define a common ground on which evangelical writers on prophecy stand. The best works accessible to English readers on prophecy have been written by John Smith, of Cambridge, Davison, and Fairbairn. Excellent articles by Hengstenburg in Kitto's Cyclopedia, and by Meyrick in Smith's Bible Dictionary, occupy

the same ground essentially; as does also Lee in his valuable work on inspiration. Writers in "Aids to Faith," and in "Replies to Essays and Reviews," follow in the same track. All these run out their own lines of thought on the subject, each favoring some points of thought with greater amplitude of discussion than others, but all bearing to the one conclusion of a divine commission to the prophet, to communicate a supernatural revelation of the higher truths of God's kingdom, as well as the future acts of God's providence.

The republication of Fairbairn's excellent treatise has brought the Christian public under a debt of gratitude to Carlton and Porter, the publishers. This work lacks the pithy conciseness of some other works, and is perhaps not quite happy in some of its interpretations; but with these abatements it is the best, because the most judicious on the whole, and the most scientifically complete, of any work on prophecy in the English language. The author's caution is observed almost always in the right places, and always with due reasons stated; nor is he often offensively conservative in respect to the points on which his theological school is apt to bring the rigors of its creed—less so, indeed, in this than in his previous work, "The Typology of the Scriptures." In respect to the absoluteness of prophecy Hengstenberg is unqualifiedly positive; but Fairbairn makes concessions as creditable to his sound judgment as they are accordant with truth. There is a conditional element in many of the prophecies. For admitting this truth, he was held to account somewhat severely by a Calvinistic journal of his country, which he silenced by the fairness and the gravity of his reply.

The scope of this treatise is a wide one. The first part investigates principles on the elementary question; the second ascertains the apologetic value of prophecy, by applying the principles to the classified groups of Bible predictions. Little or no exception can be taken to anything advanced in the elementary investigation, by those who hold to the general view of prophecy presented in our opening remarks. But this is the question in dispute in these times, especially the predictive element. Not to speak of the gross Rationalism of the day, there is a class besides, sliding off from the evangelical view of prophecy, who, though they do not squarely antagonize

with it, yet do not feel firm footing upon it as valid evidence of the truth of revelation. It was fitting the author should give a thorough discussion to this part of the subject. He has done this with calmness and on the question's own merits—not as meeting a foe in the case. We shall linger upon this more than upon the other branch of the treatise, because, if the question of predictive prophecy be proved, it is not essential that the application of it in that branch should of necessity be arbitrary, as we fear it may be in some of the author's interpretations, though, where the matter of time, and place, and number in prophecy is so uncertain, the author *may* be right, and we may be justly chary of criticism upon the specific application of his principles in given cases. We shall dwell on this with a little more fullness in its proper place. Meanwhile the contested state of the primary question demands attention.

All the varying modes of assault or objection against the phenomena of prophecy in the Old Testament may for present convenience be generalized into two classes. First, that of a ruthless and undistinguishing criticism, which makes utter slaughter of all that is supernatural in the Old Testament, and which by force of its own position is shut up to the seeing of no God, or at least but an impersonal one, in the universe; and second, the class which includes all those who hold to a low inspiration of the Old Testament, or only such an inspiration here and there as supposes, not exactly a predictive power in the prophet, but elevated instruction simply, or if predictive in any degree, not so intended as a credential for the subjects uttered, but as a quality incidental to the main design of prophecy, that of reproof, encouragement, and edification.

With the first of these classes, of course, no good comes of standing in issue on such a subject. The virtual rejection of Deity is an absolute refusal to argue any question of divine interference for men. However unwilling this class may be to be called atheists or pantheists, their position makes them such, and to this result the true course of logic holds them responsible without escape or compromise.

But with the second class the question comes into fair issue, whether the prophet of the Old Testament was a man inspired of God to stand between him and men as the revealer of his

communications, among which were facts and events that were to have their accomplishment in years or ages to come. They usually do not deny the question entirely, but evade it, by eliminating all that is divinely predictive in it, and by gauging their prophet as a man of elevated genius simply, receiving exalted exhilaration at times by forces from without, natural as well as spiritual, and occasionally raised to a sublime sagacity or clairvoyance, by which he can luckily hit upon what is to come to pass in the future. It is true a divine spirit is admitted to work upon the prophet in the production of unsurpassable poetic conception, but much in the same way as the same spirit wrought upon Homer and Virgil, Shakspeare and Milton. Grave truths, important instruction, imperative duties, were thus inculcated. By word and symbolic art, prophecy, in this sense of it, implied all the religious, moral, and intellectual agencies brought to bear vitally on the popular mind and conscience, its whole intent being to train the people to a reverence of Jehovah and his law, with both civil and religious ends in view to them as a theocratic nation. The manner of prophecy was ordinarily by vision and ecstacy, in strict keeping with Oriental temperament; for the frenzy and extravagance manifested in it are familiar facts in the mental physiology of the Eastern races to the present time. The whole body of prophecy was interfused by a divine spirit or influence, and it would naturally follow, from the form of thought which the history and character of Moses had given to Hebrew mind, that an ideal chief man or deliverer, an anointed one, should prepossess the encouraging forecastings of the prophet; but it is idle to raise these much higher than vague hopes and surmises. The same spirit makes prophets of statesmen, fills humanity with longings and aspirations, invests the lower creation with attributes of prophecy, and utters its mystic symbols over the face and within the depths of nature everywhere, all which finds an interpreter only occasionally, like Wordsworth, like Keble, like Tennyson, and so forth. Too much defining and specification is inadmissible in prophecy. The spirit that prophecies in men is not specific; to be so it must be mundane, not heavenly and transcendental. For this reason, the Book of Daniel must be ruled out; the second and the twenty-second psalms, and a portion of Zechariah, must be

recast; and the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah must be assigned to a different writer and to a later age. The necessities of theory demand such a disposal of those passages, and a similar one of others not referred to here, and if legitimate criticism will not effect it, it must be distorted till it will.

This, in substance, is a true explication, we think, of prophecy as held by a school of theological ideas now quite prevalent in the Church of England, and among liberalists in this country and elsewhere. An average of views here is attempted only to be struck, from a scale of statements ranging upward from extravagant laxness of view toward a near approach to orthodox views of prophecy. More than this we are not called on to do, to represent a general class which is governed, in its ideas of prophecy and revelation in general, apparently more by an internal sense of religiousness natural to men, than by the letter of the word, which declares that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Let us now inquire into the Scripture view of prophecy. Looking at the contents of prophecy in the Scriptures, we find that, while prediction runs through it more or less, it is not a series of mere predictions. It is a continued strain of moral doctrine—confirmed and enforced here and there by prediction—founded upon a knowledge of God, his attributes, his will, with a sense of the personal and responsible relation of man to him. It treats of the laws, the supreme dominion, the universal providence, the majesty, the spiritual being and holiness of God, and the duties which press on man related to such a being—duties of faith and worship and obedience toward God, and duties of justice and mercy and love toward man. There is not a sentiment in opposition to these original principles of piety and morals on all the pages of Old Testament prophecy. And in this regard the oracles, the manticisms, and the pagan wisdom of all the heathen ages, stand nowhere in favorable comparison with it. Omit from the contents of prophecy, for a time, all consideration of the predictive element, and attend only to the pure theology they contain, and what effect of profound conviction and moral wonder takes place in the

serious and candid mind. The skeptical reader himself will find the suspicion fastening on his mind that the teachers of so excellent and virtuous a discipline of life, the expositors of so rational a theology, are not to be set down as vain pretenders to inspiration and communication with the omniscient One, unless a parallel to this can be found among other diviners and sages, and be explainable, when found, on natural principles. And the proper, unresisted effect on him will be like to that described by St. Paul: "If therefore the whole Church be come together into one place, and all its teachers prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. And thus the secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." This is a sample of the effect which prophecy, considered only as a body of moral doctrines, is properly adequate to exercise on the candid unbeliever. In comparison with all contemporary pagan devices, let prophecy be tried by this test. There can be no doubt as to the result.

Add now the prescience of future events. The moral authority of prophecy, without this, is seen, *à priori*, to be sufficient to prove the supernatural mission of the Old Testament prophet. But add the predictive power to this authority. It *may* belong to it. There is an antecedent presumption in its favor, and none against it. Creatures related to an infinite moral governor, with understandings weak and halting, with wants so great, and moral requirements upon them so heavy, make a just demand for light and revelation, and the demand is met. God *does* reveal his law. He *has* commissioned some to be the bearers of it to men, fitting them by his inspiration to make known his will. And if his will in the present, why not in the future? There is nothing more irrational in the one than in the other. Indeed, the soul, the reason, *cries* for it; the exigences of moral government on earth at times must have been at a dead lock without it.

Do the Scripture terms *prophet*, *seer*, *men of God*, *men of the Spirit*, and the like, imply a function of revealing acts of Providence in the future? The word *prophet* is from προφήτης of the Septuagint, and answers to נָבִיא, *nâbi*, in the Hebrew, an announcer of divine oracles, a *prophet*, commonly

applied to a true and divine prophet, Deut. xxxiv, 10; metaphorically, a *messenger*, sent by God with revelations, Jeremiah xv, 19; also a *man of God*, a pious one, one belonging to God in the high sense of being in close communication with him, Gen. xx, 7. Many other similar applications of the word are given by Fürst and Gesenius. The verb from which it is derived in the Niphal and Hithpael, in which forms alone it is used, denotes a condition of ecstasy and frenzy in its several uses, the highest phases of prophetic influence; and its derivation *nâbi* is most often applied to prophets who apparently showed the greatest degree of inspiration. Hence the term admits the highest function of prophecy, that of foretelling events, as well as impressive instruction.

Two other words were predicated of the prophet: רֹאֶה, *roeh*, *seer*, replaced in great part by a later word, חֹזֶה, *chozeh*, with the same meaning. These terms, according to the views of Hävernich and Dr. Lee, denoted a less official prophetic character, yet they are affirmed of Isaiah, especially the latter word, which shows them capable of expressing sometimes the highest function of prophecy.

Gesenius (in Thesaurus, under נָבִיא) defines the prophet as God's legate who of his *own* motion speaks nothing, but only as divinely acted upon, and who, among his utterances, *futura prædicebat*, predicted things future. This great lexicographer, following his liberal inclinations, would perhaps have been a reluctant witness for such a meaning; so that the full weight of well-considered philological reasons comes as possibly a more impartial and authoritative voucher for this high sense of prophecy.

While the designation "man of God" implied intimate communion with God, commission from God, etc., the word "seer," and the phrase "man of the Spirit," (רוּחַ) referred probably to the mode of the prophetic influence, as well as to its miraculous character. The usual but not universal mode was by dreams and visions. In Numbers xii, 6–8, we have the following discrimination of God's method of acting on his prophets: "Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and I will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all his house. With him will I speak

mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold." This doubtless completely sums up the different ways in which the revelations of God were made to man, namely, by vision, dream, and direct declaration and manifestation. The last of these would seem to be the highest and most distinguished—implying the highest state of psychological fitness for holding communications with God; and Moses and Jesus exemplified the prophetic function in this state. And in this state it is probable the prophet had knowledge of the full import of the oracles he uttered. But did those who prophesied in "dreams" and in "visions" have such knowledge? In some cases perhaps not, and possibly not in *any* case beyond the first and local meaning of those prophecies which were pregnant of a higher and a typical meaning to be unfolded in the future. It must be remembered that the "seer" was in this state not by his own will, that he was a passive speaker for God, that he uttered only what was revealed to him to say, and that to know the meaning of what he said depended on God's pleasure to make it known to him. All is miracle. And connected with these points are the hardest problems of prophecy. The perplexing question of "double sense" comes in here; upon which less of reproach would have been cast if right-minded interpreters had heeded less the overawing *dicta* of Rationalists, and had more wisely discriminated as to what was excessive, and what was judicious and essential, in the system of the old expositors.

But upon this we shall soon touch again. That which resulted from the prophetic state was miraculous. It came not by man. His own genius originated nothing of it, but served simply as the channel through which it passed directly from God. The style and diction of prophecy partook, of course, of peculiarities which the mind of the seer imparted. But the contents of prophecy were God's, not the seer's, except when God should reveal them to his consciousness, which would occur when the lesson of the prophecy was to be enforced immediately. When also the mind of the seer in this state was raised to a prescience of events future, the same would occur if the instant proclamation of events were commanded. It is conceivable, indeed, that God might have revealed all meanings,

present and remote; but this is not essential to the predictive character of prophecy, for prediction, in whatever way rendered, is both possible and probable, and its validity in no wise to be denied, unless atheism be true, unless there be no personal God, and no moral government nor overruling Providence.

It is easy to see the relation between the state into which the seer was raised, and the character of his oracles. The latter, a natural consequence of the former, were figurative, fragmentary, and vague, because often abstracted from the relations of time, and sometimes possibly also of place. Against this character of the divine predictions, objections have been brought, perhaps the most serious objections that ever have been or can be raised against any feature of the prophecies. The predictions, as a series, pointed to the mission, divine character, kingdom, and ultimate universal dominion of the Messiah. And it is claimed by objectors that the policy of revelation on these subjects is a presumption against the high doctrinal interpretation of the Messiah commonly given to these predictions; that a definite, full, and plain account *in prose* of so important a subject would have gained the convictions of the world far better. To these Hengstenburg and others have in effect replied, that God knows best his own mode of most effectively addressing a gainsaying, revolted province of his creation; that men are not forced to believe, and wicked men would not believe, with a plainer account before them, while good men *will* believe without it; that a plainer revelation would but give greater advantage to the rebellious hosts "against Jehovah and his Anointed;" and that, for a wholesome discipline of the faith of men, not a few of the prophecies relating to the Messiah were intended to be of growing application, with some portions to be understood only on their complete fulfillment.

This last consideration is of great moment. It takes in the problems of the *double sense* of prophecy, of the types, and of the deeper meanings of Scripture. Let us consider each of these, but in the inverse order here stated. The Rationalist theory of the literal and single sense of Scripture reduces the Bible to a human affair; yet its influence, conjoined with an influence entirely the opposite, that of an excessive and puerile use, by unscientific hands, of the deeper meanings, types, etc., of Scrip-

ture, has contributed to so serious a caution in the modern improved system of interpretation, as to emasculate the Bible of much of the strength of its evangelical character. Limits should be set to our Scripture conceptions by definitions that will stand under all trials, if possible; but when terms are defined so closely as, in their application, to pare away some essential doctrinal thought, such a scientific system of interpretation, so called, may justly be considered, we think, a little overdone—too great a concession to Rationalists of a possible peril to our "more sure word of prophecy." Are we far enough advanced into the ages, as a race, to have so full a development of the truth stored in the Scriptures as justly to apply, at this time, square and compass, line and plummet, and crucible tests, to every part thereof? If not, the times of this ignorance God may now wink at, but soon he will command all men everywhere to repent in these respects.

For prophecy sweeps over all the tracts of time. And it must not be forgotten that God *could* so impregnate it with meanings that it should require all the ages for the expanding mind of the race to comprehend those meanings. No fair-minded man can gainsay the presumption that he did so impregnate some of them. Bacon so thought when he said, "Divine prophecies, being of the nature of their Author, with whom a thousand years are but as one day, are therefore not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment, though the height or fullness of them may refer to some one age." Even De Wette, in his later and more orthodox days, admitted so much of this as to say that "the entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of Him who was to come, and has come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of Christ long before he came, and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, descried the new doctrine?" This admission of the deeper meanings of Scripture up to the time of Christ, is a virtual admission also that they exist and will exist in some of the prophecies to the end of the world.

If the Old Testament, as a body of doctrinal hints couched in its history, its poetry, and its institutions, is but an adumbration of what the new dispensation develops, there is within it a vast amount of what are called deeper meanings, which is

beyond the power of being fully understood, except as time, and light spiritual and providential, shall make them plain. Such of these meanings as have already transpired reveal no special law by which others can be completely unlocked in advance of their fulfillment. Laws applying to parables in the New Testament will apply to the same in the Old Testament. So of allegories, symbols, and fulfilled predictions. The exodus of Israel, though but an historic fact, apparently plain enough on its face, was to the prophet Hosea an event of deeper import, and arose to the character of a type in Matt. ii, 15. This, and doubtless many Old Testament historic incidents, were prophetic events. That the Psalms are full of these deep doctrines, which come to be apprehended in the course of ages, is generally admitted. Devout minds were always refreshed and strengthened by these incomparable lyrics, and the more profound their reverence of God, their love for his sanctuary, their sympathy with all his plans of providence, the deeper their spiritual discernment entered into the underlying significance of many of the psalms which so depict, in each of them, some trait, some lineament in the character or reign of the coming Redeemer. The event of his coming has disclosed the second, tenth, sixteenth, twenty-second, forty-fifth, seventy-second, and the one hundred and tenth—at least these—as clearly referring to some feature, act, or condition relating to him. How far the original utterers of these deep, grand truths were permitted themselves to apprehend them, of course cannot be known. It would seem that the sacred elevation of their souls in their inspired condition should have afforded at least a refreshing glimpse of these truths, if no more; but such things are beyond our present knowledge. There is not the positive evidence we desire that even Moses, at Exod. iii, 15, caught a view of the doctrine of the resurrection, which Christ declared, Matt. xxii, 31, as found in the words, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," etc. We mourn this lack of evidence; yet, despite of it, the first prophetic promise to Adam may have conveyed to him a hint of the resurrection; the tree of life in Eden may have fitted his mind for its reception, and the thought that the spoiler, death, should some time be conquered, may have become deeper among the patriarchs and prophets of the old dispensa-

tion till in Christ's time it was a settled article of Hebrew belief. This being so, there was a peculiar poignancy in the Saviour's rebuke to Sadducean obtuseness on this doctrine: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God."

From these indefinite deeper meanings of Scripture we pass to Types. These have an eminent place in the department of Prophecy. Fairbairn has not discussed these in the volume before us, but in a former work he has elaborated the subject to an unprecedented extent. In opposition to the school of Marsh, followed by Moses Stuart and others in this country, whose canon is, "So much of the Old Testament is to be accounted typical as the New Testament affirms to be so, *and no more*," Fairbairn justly claims, we think, that a greater fullness of typical matter must exist in the Old Testament than this canon allows, whether so designated in the New Testament or not: for the reason that the whole Old Testament system has its larger setting forth, its fuller development, in the New; that each part of this system is correlated to each successive part, the patriarchal to the ritualististic, and this to the prophetic, the relation of successive rise and advancement in each, so that, as a whole, with the divine law as its central principle, it is well designated by the Apostle Paul as "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." A relation so formed, and subsisting to such an extent, between Old and New Testament things, clearly implies that Christ and the salvation he brings to the world were the ultimate objects toward which all the previous training of the Old Testament Church was tending and struggling; the great antitypes, respecting which the whole previous system of appointed resemblances and shadows were designed to give instruction. A true notion of a type is, thus, that it is not only *a* resemblance between things, institutions, and persons—or offices and functions which persons perform—and the objects which answer to them in the New Testament, but that it is an *appointed* resemblance, and so partakes of the character of prophecy. And it is unsafe to say how many of these there may be in the Old Testament system. Vastly more, doubtless, than are designated in the New Testament; though a judicious handling of types in interpretation requires us to go practically not far beyond the quoted, or the really obvious, examples of Old Testament bearing on the new dispensation. The sub-

jective feeling of the devout interpreter may warrant him to appropriate a large body of passages as possibly and probably having such bearing; and if they show the true marks which characterize a type, otherwise than a New Testament use or reference, we see no harm in their adoption as such. Such marks seem to us considerately presented by Fairbairn in his work on Typology.

But we touched the subject of types on account of their prophetic character. Many of them are introduced by the phrase, *ἵνα πληρώθῃ, that might be fulfilled*, which denotes purpose, not a mere correspondence to a fact *so that was fulfilled*, that is, so that events were moulded and adapted to correspond to something stated in an ancient book, as the Rationalists force the expression to mean; for this would require us to believe that the Divine Being himself has contrived certain events, *not* that his will should thereby be accomplished, but that they might agree with a so-called prophecy. When this expression is affirmed of any event which Christ is said to have brought about, this meaning of it makes him to do the same absurd thing. Rather, the expression evidently means their preordained fulfillment of a fact denoted by an ancient event, or thing, to which the fact in question, at some or more points, has a prefigured likeness. And the truth of the fulfillment is bound up with the prophetic truth of the ancient type predicting it. We would not, with Alford, Meyer, and others, press this absolute telic force of the particle *ἵνα* everywhere. Ellicott, in his comment on Ephesians i, 17, and Winer in his Grammar, admit, as an exception, the weakened force of the particle in some cases. But in the case before us, wherever *ἵνα πληρώθῃ* is used in the New Testament to express the idea of fulfillment of what had been predicted by formal prophecy or type, it carries its full meaning of purpose that such prophecy or type is or shall be fulfilled by the event under consideration. And why not, since the prediction and its fulfillment constitute God's unbroken system in the Bible of instruction, discipline, and providence to fit the race for the completion of his mediatorial scheme? Prediction and fulfillment over and over again, as a method of training to the race, are necessary to unify all parts of this vast scheme; but from Adam to the last born of the world He infringes on no one's

freedom in carrying out each preordained plan; he only overrules and shapes whatever result is projected from each one's free, unconstrained action within this scheme.

The order of thought in the New Testament narrative and discussions does not require the prescriptive formula, *ἵνα πληρώθῃ* for all typical references; but all have, nevertheless, the same predictive element. For if the philological argument in *ἵνα* secures this element to the few to which this formula *is* appropriate, by fair inference the few give character to the whole. And the sacred penmen of the New Testament were, by the Holy Spirit, raised to such an appreciation of the deeper meanings of the more than six hundred quotations from the Old Testament, cited as formal prophecies, and types, and proofs, and enforcements, that they all may be regarded as more or less of a prophetic character, with an upward gradation of deeper meanings, types, and formal prediction.

But is there a double sense to any formal prophecy? Fairbairn and some other modern writers think not, and treat the question as settled. But to all minds it is not settled. For prophecy *seems* so framed in some of its predictions as to bear a sense directed to two objects. We will enumerate at least three: those relating to the establishment of the kingdom of David, to the restoration from the Captivity, and to the dissolution of the Jewish polity. Let all others be left out of account, because of the greater uncertainty of the question in their case. Davison is, perhaps, the most searching, yet the most cautious advocate of this question. The double sense of prophecy, he says, (Discourses on Prophecy, p. 144,) "is not the convenient latitude of two unconnected senses, wide of each other, and giving room to a fallacious ambiguity; but the combination of two related, analogous, and harmonizing, though disparate subjects, each clear and definite in itself; implying a twofold truth in the prescience, and creating an aggravated *difficulty*, and thereby an accumulated proof, in the completion. For a case in point: to justify the predictions concerning the kingdom of David in their double force, it must be shown of them that they hold in each of their relations, and in each were fulfilled. So that a double sense of prophecy, in its true idea, is a check upon the pretenses of a vague and unappropriated prediction, rather than a door to admit them." "But this is

not all. For if the prediction distribute its sense into two remote branches or systems of the divine economy; if it show not only what is to take place in distant times, but describe also different modes of God's appointment, though holding a certain and intelligible resemblance to each other; such prediction becomes not only more convincing in the argument, but more instructive in the doctrine, because it expresses the correspondence of God's dispensations in their points of argument, as well as his foreknowledge." He then proceeds to offer a test of the validity and the rectitude of "double sense," to show when it may with safety, and should with reason, be admitted. The test is, that the subjects ascribed to the prophecy may, each in its main import, challenge an equal right to be recognized as belonging to such prophecy, each being, at the same time, alike and equally concerned in exhibiting its drift. When each subject can assert its own claim in this manner, and when other reasonable conditions are observed as to the known general tone and tendency of the whole volume of prophecy, then the principle of a twofold application is clear, and the prophecy is doubly authentic.

There are few prophecies, it must be confessed, which will entirely bear this test. But we believe it will apply safely and soundly to at least the three already mentioned. For we do not see it to be material that both subjects in these prophecies should be equally coextensive in the scope of their import and circumstances, or in that of their fulfillment. The temporal realm of the first David is of course not equal in extent and power to the spiritual realm of the great Son of David. The temporal deliverance from the Captivity, and the great spiritual restoration, are indeed "disparate subjects;" and so are the destruction of the Jewish polity and the world's last judgment; but as these pairs of subjects assert a divided application in their respective prophecies, as to their main import, that wherein the intent of their prediction lay, namely, that both should be alike fulfilled, no further likeness is needed to give authority to "double sense."

This, if we rightly understand Fairbairn in his Typology, vol. i, p. 130 *seq.*, may in a degree meet objections raised by him against the arguments and test of Davison. His endeavor seems to be to resolve this class of prophecies into Types; all

proper enough, if thereby the subject of Types be not overdone. On so grave a question the motive of all, of course, is truth, and such a presentation of prophecy, in all its phases, as shall do for it the greatest apologetic service. For this last named object it does seem that "double sense," if legitimately sustained and restricted, ministers strength to evidence. The monumental prophecies, named above, seem so obvious and definite in their signatures, that unbelief cannot effectually encounter them.

Thus much on the elementary relations of prophecy. For want of space some important relations have been left untouched. The drift of thought has been toward what, in the light both of propriety and necessity, prior to all complex considerations, the character of prophecy should be, an inspired miraculous character, containing in an eminent degree the predictive element, and so constituting the basis of irrefragable evidence that the whole divine record is indisputably from God.

The main body of Fairbairn on Prophecy is devoted to showing the value of prophecy on the ground of this character, as an impregnable defense against the assaults of unbelievers. This apologetic value is evinced from the bearing of prophecy on the Jewish people, on the Messiah, on the first destruction of Jerusalem, and on the states and kingdoms in adjacency and contact with the people of Israel. The unfulfilled prophecies also are extensively treated, relating to the future of the Jewish people and of the Christian Church. On these there is room for considerable differences of opinion, on account of the difference of canons for interpreting unfulfilled predictions. We pass these with the remark that the author's discussions throughout are full of the richest suggestions and instruction, whether his conclusions in every case can or cannot be accepted. His instinct for judiciousness seldom, if ever, forsakes him. And if one may happen not to agree with a particular interpretation here and there, a special stress upon this or that fact in a prediction, it will not so happen because the author is either rash or capricious; but for reasons just stated, in respect to which men of equally excellent judgment may differ, in such an uncertain field as that of unfulfilled prophecy.

In his presentation of prophecies fulfilled, he has arranged the facts in a manner to subject the unbeliever to the most

awkward shifts, if he does not concede to prediction its own miraculous origin. Moabite, Tyrian, and Jew are summoned; Edom, Babylon, and Egypt are appealed to; and the testimony borne to the truth of prediction—prediction which only precise knowledge of the eternal future can cause to be uttered—seals the character of prophecy forever beyond the power of the caviler to give it serious harm.

Profounder interest and attention are due to this branch of evidence to the truth of our holy religion. These, of late years, in comparison with its co-ordinate branch, miracles, it has lacked. Less palpable, because it has not yet traveled the whole tract of the future, as it requires, to enlarge the domain of its facts, and thereby to deepen its power, it has suffered loss from neglect, and the effect of such loss is not duly felt. Miracle is the chief point of assault in these days, and consequently the evidence most studied and guarded. But prophecy is also miracle, with only, or at least chiefly, the signature of prediction as its differentia, which suffices to make it a department by itself; and the study of this branch is therefore, in effect, the study of both. So that the divinity of its truths and morals, the philosophy of its inspiration, the sublime conceptions it utters, all added to its character as miracle, give it a high claim to the profoundest interest and study of every devout thinker.

Art. III.—METHODISM IN CANADA.

The History of Methodism in Canada. By G. F. Playter. Toronto: Anson Green. 1862.

Minutes of Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, 1824–66.

Christian Guardian. Toronto: 1829–66.

The Union Considered. By Rev. Thos. Webster. Hamilton. 1858.

Wesleyan Methodism in Upper Canada. A Sermon by Egerton Ryerson. Toronto. 1837.

Canada was discovered and possessed by the French in 1534, and ceded to the British crown in 1763, at which time it had a population of 69,000, exclusive of Indians. The western part of the province was an almost unbroken wilder-

ness, the only settlers being a few French emigrants, who had located themselves in the vicinity of the forts and trading posts, and along the shores of the bays and lakes from Montreal to Detroit.

Just before the "Revolutionary War," the attention of the government was directed to the opening up and settlement of what is now Western Canada; and some thousands of families from the then "American provinces," who preferred a monarchical form of government to the uncertainties of a new republic, abandoned their homes and sought an asylum in the wilderness of the North. They were received with marked attention by the government, and, in addition to large grants of land, such other assistance was afforded them as their destitute circumstances rendered necessary. These, with the families of some disbanded soldiers, and a few emigrants from Britain, gave to the western province, in 1783, a population of not more than twelve thousand.

The progress of Western Canada is to be dated from 1791, when, by an act of the British Parliament, it was separated from Lower Canada. With a constitution as liberal as could be desired, and which leaves nothing to be coveted from other countries, a spirit of self-reliance and energy has been infused into the minds of its people; the tide of emigration has flowed to its shores; its vast forests have been thrown into market for sale and possession; its natural resources have become every year more valuable; while the changes that have taken place in the government have fostered a spirit of independence and of patriotism which has secured all the concomitants of civilization, and the establishment of those purifying and elevating institutions which pertain only to Christian communities. In intelligence, industry, and morality, the inhabitants of Western Canada will not suffer in any comparison; while the elastic freedom of its society, the unbounded fields open to its enterprise, its unrivaled and successful school system, and the absence of much of that unmitigated poverty which belongs to older countries, render it a most inviting home.

Methodism was introduced into the province in 1791, and has had much to do in moulding the minds of the people, and preparing them for the success they have achieved. As a Christian organization it had been in operation for about half

a century before its influence was felt to any appreciable extent in Canada. In the United States it had been exerting its influence and gathering its trophies for twenty-five years, and for seven years had existed as the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, when, early in the year 1791, William Losee, a member of the New York Conference, visited Canada, and laid the foundation of the Methodist Church. Previous to this, an officer of a cavalry regiment, Major Neal, had preached with acceptance on the Niagara frontier, and most likely had formed a society. In the Bay of Quinte country a pious young man, a Mr. Lyon, a school teacher, was made useful in the conversion of many persons, as was also Mr. James M'Carty, a man of attractive manners and sweet spirit, whose testimony for the truth exposed him to great persecution. Being brought before some magistrates, he was sentenced to banishment from the country, and, as some suppose, was either left to starve upon one of the uninhabited islands in the St. Lawrence, or drowned in its waters.

The Rev. William Losee was the first regular Methodist minister who visited Canada. He was appointed by the New York Conference at the request of some settlers in the townships on the Bay of Quinte. From Lake Champlain, where he had been stationed the previous year, he made his way to the St. Lawrence. Crossing at St. Regis, he preached in the various settlements of refugees on the north bank of the river, till he arrived at Adolphustown, where, on Sunday, the 20th February, 1791, the first class was formed at the residence of Mr. Paul Huff, on whose farm the first Methodist church was also erected the following year. Losee was appointed the second year to Canada, which is now called *Kingston* Circuit, and is placed with Lynn, Hartford, and other New England towns, under the supervision of Jesse Lee. The next year the country was divided into two circuits: Darius Dunham was appointed to Kingston, now called *Cataraqui;* and William Losee to the new circuit called *Oswegatchie*, embracing several townships on the north side of the St. Lawrence, east of Kingston, settled principally by refugees. These circuits were associated with Albany and Saratoga, under the care of Freeborn Garrettson. As Dunham was an elder, it was decided, before the brethren separated, to hold a quarterly meeting. Accordingly on Satur

day, the 9th September, 1792, the first Church business meeting was held; and the following day, Sunday, the first sacramental service and love-feast. Doubtless it was a high day to the Methodists of the Bay of Quinte country. The year closed with accessions to the Church. The success of early Methodism in Canada is seen in the fact, that at the close of its first decade it had five circuits, eleven ministers, and eleven hundred and fifty-nine members. At the close of its second decade it rises to the number of twelve circuits, with eighteen ministers, and two thousand seven hundred and ninety-two members. The whole of the frontier, from Quebec to Windsor, was supplied with the ministrations of the word.

These were days of extensive revivals, of divine visitation, of powerful conversions, the days of men whose names in some families and neighborhoods are as "ointment poured forth;" Dunham, Wooster, Keeler, Bangs, Coleman, Coates, and others; names

"Sacred beyond heroic fame."

With a population of only seventy-seven thousand, and the settlements in some instances sixty miles apart, the success of these men was amazing. Often the preacher, in going to his appointments, had his choice between encamping in the woods for the night or sleeping in an Indian hut; almost boundless forests were traversed, with no other indication for direction than a blazed tree; and when the settler's shanty was reached there was often nothing but the meanest fare, rarely the luxury of a bed. Yet these men performed prodigies of labor; they swam rivers, forded creeks, plodded through swamps, encountered snow and rain, heat and cold; amid pain and weariness, hunger and almost nakedness, they did the work of evangelists. They were men of breadth of soul—large sympathies, fine feelings. Alas, many of them broke down in their work, and after enduring scorn, derision, and contempt, went early to their reward.

The years of the war, known as the "American War," were very disastrous years to the progress of Methodism in Canada. Many of the ministers being American citizens, left the province, and only those of Canadian or British birth remained; and they found it exceedingly difficult to command a congre-

gation, preaching frequently to none but women and children. The Upper Canadian work was well supplied by Ryan, Rhodes, Whitehead, Adams, and Prindle, assisted by the staff of preachers who had located or retired from the general work; but Lower Canada was almost abandoned. At the Genesee Conference in 1815 the number of members returned is one thousand seven hundred and sixty-five, showing a loss during the war of one thousand and twenty-seven. As soon as peace was restored the preachers returned to the province, and labored with the same zeal and fervor as before; but the strong political feeling and strife greatly obstructed the progress of the work. In 1818 the Genesee Conference was held in Canada, in Elizabethtown, then a part of the Augusta circuit; at which sixty-six preachers, including the twenty-two in the Canadian work, convened under the superintendency of Bishop George. At this Conference a remarkable revival of religion commenced, which affected the whole work, especially the country bordering on the Bay of Quinte and on the Niagara frontier, resulting in an increase to the Church of over one thousand five hundred members. Yet these were "troublous times." Methodism was treated by many with ridicule and scorn, its ministers were regarded as political spies, some of whom fell victims to magisterial persecution. As Dr. Ryerson observed in a sermon preached nearly thirty years ago:

> Up to a very recent period Methodism has been regarded by many leading magistrates and other civil officers throughout the province, and by the most prominent members of the executive, as dangerous to the supremacy of British power, and the combined influence of men of wealth and learning, together with the civil government itself, from the representative of the king, (with but few exceptions,) down to the church sexton, has been arrayed against the progress of Methodism, and bent, as far as the spirit of the age would permit, upon its extermination.

Yet it prospered, and maintained its influence upon the community. At that time there were twenty-eight Methodist ministers, and sixteen ministers of the Church of England; and the relative influence of the Churches may be gathered from the fact, that, in a population of one hundred and twenty thousand, the communicants of the Church of England numbered three hundred and twenty-eight, while the communicants of the Methodist Church numbered five thousand five hundred

and fifty-seven; from which we may also see why it was thought necessary by the ruling party of the day to obstruct its progress. The Methodist ministers, from the time they came to the province, had performed the rite of marriage when applied to, much to the satisfaction and convenience of the people. This privilege was now denied to them, and an old statute of George the Second was put in force, causing great inconvenience and annoyance to all not of the Church of England. From this time that political contest commenced, which grew in strength from year to year, till equal civil and religious rights were secured to all classes, irrespective of creed.

Another difficulty, which presented itself at this time, arose out of the appointment of ministers by the English Conference to stations in Lower Canada occupied by ministers of the American Conference. From 1803 till the time of the war, the cities and other parts of Eastern Canada were regularly supplied by ministers from the United States. In 1815 the English Conference appointed two ministers to that province. Bishop Asbury objected to such a course, and the matter was referred to the General Conference of 1816, when, by invitation, the Revs. Messrs. Bennett and Black, the representatives of the English Conference, were present. Notwithstanding the decision of the Conference was adverse to the action of the European missionaries, they not only remained in Lower Canada, but, upon the invitation of parties in Upper Canada, made aggressions upon the peaceful societies in that province. The subject came before the General Conference of 1820, by petition from some of the circuits in Canada, complaining of the interference of the English missionaries, and praying that the ministry which had been so fully owned and blessed of God might be continued to them; while others, tired of agitation, yet favorable to the American ministers, petitioned for an independent Canadian Conference, as the only means of removing the objections of a political character, which were continually urged against them to their great disadvantage. The Conference assured the people that they would not forsake them, and appointed the Rev. John Emory, of Baltimore, a representative to the English Conference, with power to settle the matter in dispute; and at the same time authorized the bishops, with the consent of the Genesee Conference, to which

the preachers in Canada belonged, to organize a Conference in Canada if necessary. When the matter was laid before the British Conference, they, with great magnanimity, admitted that their conduct had been altogether wrong, and blamed themselves that they had not obtained more accurate information, and generously acceded to the wishes of the American Conference. So the matter was amicably settled, the English occupying the Lower Province, except the rough country on the Ottawa, the Upper Province being supplied as formerly.

Between the General Conference of 1820 and that of 1824, the Canadian Church participated in the discussions at that time common among both preachers and people on the subject of "Church Government," and for some cause or other neither of the presiding elders in the Canadian work were elected delegates to the General Conference of 1824. This had a most disastrous effect upon Henry Ryan. He had been a representative at previous Conferences, and for years had been a conspicuous man in the body to which he belonged. He had traversed the whole length of the province during the war, had withstood the encroachments of the European missionaries, and had performed more work than any other minister in Canada. He could not well bear to be set aside, and at once began that system of agitation which ultimately severed him from the Church for which he had labored and suffered so much. A convention was called for the "purpose of seeking a separation from the Church in the States," and Ryan and a local preacher were appointed delegates to the General Conference to secure that object. Ryan and his co-delegate were refused a seat in that body, and properly so. This action of the Conference surprised no one less than Ryan, for no one understood the question of rights in that body better than he. Nevertheless, the subject of the separation of the Canadian societies and preachers was duly considered, and the Conference decided:

"1. That there shall be a Canadian Conference under our superintendency, bounded by the boundary line of Upper Canada.

"2. That a circular shall be addressed to our preachers and members within the bounds of the Canada Conference, ex-

pressive of our zeal for their prosperity, and urging the importance of their maintaining union among themselves."

But this did not satisfy Ryan. An independent Church was what he professed to want. The whole of his district was greatly agitated. Public meetings were held, and a determination expressed to take an independent position. At this juncture Bishops George and Hedding came into the province with Nathan Bangs, and in preaching, and explaining the true position of affairs, succeeded in allaying the fears of the Church, and producing acquiescence in the action of the General Conference.

The first Canadian Conference was held in the village of *Hollowell*, now the town of Pictou, Prince Edward County, on the 25th of August, 1824, Bishops George and Hedding presiding. The Conference consisted of thirty preachers, with a membership of six thousand one hundred and fifty. Of those who composed the first Conference, and of those who were then received on trial, there are a few who yet linger in the ranks of the superannuated; but not one is now found in the regular work. At this Conference a strong desire was manifested for a separate and independent position, and a memorial was presented to the bishops, to be laid before the Annual Conferences, stating the reasons for the separation. They say "that the state of the country required it; that the insulated and extended situation of the societies from the general superintendency, and the jealousies recently awakened by the Government, rendered it expedient." But the reason that weighed the most with them is given in the last paragraph of the memorial:

> To us it appears expedient that the societies here should become a Church, separate from the body in the United States, in order to secure privileges which are of importance for the prosperity of religion here. At present we are not permitted to perform the rights of marriage to our members; nor indeed have we any legal security for one of our numerous chapels in this province; and we have been assured that in our present relation we must not expect any extension of privileges. Though we cannot assure ourselves of such advantages by becoming a separate body, yet we can apply for those privileges with more confidence; and we think we have reason to hope, that when petitions shall be presented to the government from an independent Church in this country, our privileges will be granted and our property secured.

These, brethren, are the reasons which have been presented to our minds, and which appear to us of weight and moment in favor of a separation, and in order to preserve the body of Methodists in this country from the most disastrous of all events—that of division among ourselves.

An address was also sent to the societies informing them of the action of the Conference.

With this method of settling the difficulties that had arisen, Ryan expressed satisfaction and acquiescence; but his course had been so flagrant that he was removed from his position as presiding elder and appointed to the Grand River mission. This was more than he could brook, although great lenity and consideration was extended toward him in view of the services he had rendered the Church; yet dissatisfaction returned; he had lost the chance of ruling, and lost it for ever.

About the year 1822 a most interesting work commenced among the Indians at the Grand River, which soon spread to the other Indian tribes in various sections of the province. Many were converted, and from a state of vice, wretchedness, and degradation, were brought to habits of industry, order, and religion. Schools were established among them, and the missionaries were cheered in their toil by the marked improvement of the tribes. At the Conference of 1824 a missionary society was formed, auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the M. E. Church; several branch societies being already in existence, from which one hundred and four dollars was received as the contribution of the year.

In 1791, when the "Constitutional act" separated Upper from Lower Canada, a provision was made for the support of a Protestant clergy, by setting apart one seventh of the land, and reserving the proceeds for their benefit, the management of the "*reserves*," as they were commonly called, being vested in the executive of the province. In 1819, under the auspices of the Earl Bathurst, an exclusive and bigoted Churchman, these "reserves" were placed under the control and management of a corporation of the clergy of the Church of England, under the direction of the Bishop of Quebec. A dispute having arisen between the House of Assembly and the Executive in reference to these lands, the country and the Assembly were taken by surprise to find them transferred from the executive to such a corporation. The general election of 1824

resulted in the return to Parliament of a majority of members known as Reformers, whose platform was "equal rights and privileges to all classes." The Methodists, now a powerful body in the province, and smarting under the disabilities forced upon them, and the harsh and severe treatment they had received, gave this party their hearty support. The Methodist political creed of that day was short, easily understood, reasonable, and righteous:

1. That all Christian Churches should be put upon the same footing as the Church of England in respect to rights of property and all other civil privileges.
2. That the Church of the minority of the population ought not to be established with exclusive or particular privileges.
3. That no exclusive system of education should be established in the province, but that all classes of the population should be equally countenanced and assisted in the promotion of education.

The position of parties was by no means improved by the accession to the irresponsible executive, of the leader of the State Church party, the Hon. and Rev. John Strachan, D.D., then Archdeacon of York, now Bishop of Toronto, who soon after provoked the opposition of the Methodists by a most unmerited and uncalled for attack upon their ministers. In a sermon preached on the occasion of the death of Bishop Mountain, he had charged upon Methodist ministers that they were "idle, ignorant, and republican in their sentiments." The sermon was reviewed in the "Colonial Advocate," a paper published in the interest of the Liberal party, by a young preacher who had just been taken on trial, and who was yet to act a prominent part in the future history of his country, and of the Church of which he was a member, the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, now Dr. Ryerson, General Superintendent of Education in Canada West. The controversy was kept up for many months, the public generally awarding the victory to the "Methodist preacher." The opposition to the ruling party grew stronger, and the foul slander was trampled under foot as unworthy of those who made it, and of the cause in behalf of which it was made. But the storm became furious when, two years later, the same archdeacon drew up a chart and letter descriptive of the religious state of Upper Canada, which, being forwarded to the Home Government, was laid before the House of Commons, and by them ordered to be printed. Copies of this document soon found

their way to Canada, and steps were taken to induce the House of Assembly to investigate the statement made in the communications of Dr. Strachan, and the misrepresentation of the principles of other denominations, especially the Methodists. The doctor states in his letter:

> The teachers of the different denominations, with the exception of the two ministers of the Church of Scotland, four Congregationalists, and a respectable English missionary who presides over a Wesleyan Methodist meeting at Kingston, are for the most part from the United States, where they gather their knowledge and form their sentiments. Indeed, the Methodist teachers are subject to the orders of the Conference of the United States of America; and it is manifest that the Colonial Government neither has, nor can have any other control over them, or prevent them from gradually rendering a large portion of the population, by their influence and instructions, hostile to our institutions, both civil and religious, than by increasing the number of the Established Clergy.

A select committee was appointed by the House. Some fifty witnesses were examined—legislators, magistrates, and others—all of whom bore strong testimony to the moral and political integrity, zeal, and usefulness of the men who had been so grossly misrepresented. In their Report the Committee say:

> The insinuations in the letter against the Methodist clergymen the committee have noticed with peculiar regret. To the disinterested and indefatigable exertions of these pious men, this province owes much. At an early period of its history, when it was thinly settled, and its inhabitants were scattered through the wilderness, and destitute of all other means of religious instruction, these ministers of the gospel, animated by Christian zeal and benevolence, at the sacrifice of health and interest and comfort, carried among the people the blessings and consolations and sanctions of our holy religion. Their influence and instruction, far from having (as is represented in the letter) a tendency hostile to our institutions, have been conducive, in a degree which cannot easily be estimated, to the reformation of their hearers from licentiousness, and the diffusion of correct morals, the foundation of all sound loyalty and social order. There is no reason to believe that, as a body, they have failed to inculcate, by precept and example, as a Christian duty, an attachment to the sovereign, and a cheerful and conscientious obedience to the laws of the country. More than thirty-five years have elapsed since they commenced their labors in the colonies. In that time the province has passed through a war which put to the proof the loyalty of the people. If their influence and instructions have the tendency mentioned, the effects by this time must be manifest; yet no one doubts that

the Methodists are as loyal as any of his Majesty's subjects. And the very fact that, while their clergymen are dependent for their support upon the voluntary contributions of their people, the number of their members has increased so as to be now, in the opinion of almost all the witnesses, greater than that of the members of any other denomination in this province, is a complete refutation of any suspicion that their influence and instructions have such a tendency; for it would be a gross slander on the loyalty of the people to suppose that they would countenance and listen with complacency to those whose influence was exerted for such base purposes.

The House of Assembly ordered a copy of the Report, with the accompanying evidence and charts, to be transmitted to the Imperial Government, and adopted an address to the king on the subject, in which it is said:

We humbly beg leave to assure your Majesty that the insinuations in the letter against the Methodist preachers in this province do much injustice to a body of pious and deserving men, who justly enjoy the confidence, and are the spiritual instructors of a large portion of your Majesty's subjects in this province. We are convinced that the tendency of their influence and instruction is not hostile to our institutions, but, on the contrary, is eminently favorable to religion and morality; and their labors are calculated to make their people better men and better subjects, and have already produced in this province the happiest effects.

Such a statement, at such a time, was not only highly honorable to those who made it, but was appreciated by the Methodists, and it greatly confirmed them in their opposition to the State Church party. For a number of years the contention was fierce and uncompromising. The High Church party, not succeeding in their attempts to prevent the progress of liberal principles by public discussion, now tried to promote a schism in the Methodist Church. The Indians, who had been cared for by them, and among whom they had been useful, were now tampered with by the archdeacon and others in authority; they were told that no aid could be given to them while they were under the teaching and care of the Methodists. Henry Ryan appeared on the stage again as an agitator, stimulated by some great loyalists, such as Dr. Strachan, Willson of Wentworth, and some government officials. Ryan professed to desire a separation from the Church in the United States, and the establishment of a Colonial Church, which he had the means of knowing would be obtained shortly in a constitu-

tional way. Whatever of bitterness there might have been in the High Church opposition, it could not compare with the violent abuse and invective with which Ryan assailed preachers and people, especially the bishops; but, finding that the great body of the people had no sympathy with him, he withdrew from the Church, and formed a party known as the "Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Church."

In Lower Canada the work had been regularly supplied by the English Conference from 1815, and now numbered nine ministers and over eighteen hundred members. Such was the state of the country and such the position of the Church when the General Conference sat in Pittsburgh, in May, 1828. In that body the Canadian Conference was represented by Revs. W. Chamberlain, B. Slater, S. Belton, Wm. Ryerson, and John Ryerson. The question of the separation of the Canada Conference came up for settlement, when the General Conference, understanding the position of the Canadian Church as set forth in the memorial to the annual conferences, consented to the separation by a large majority, if not unanimously, and made provision for the maintenance of the work among the Indians and new settlers by recommending an annual grant from the mission fund, (a liberality which is appreciated, and which it is refreshing to remember,) and provided also for the ordination of a general superintendent.

The Canada Conference assembled in Switzer's Church, Earnesttown, on the 2d day of October, 1828, Bishop Hedding presiding. The Committee to whom the subject of independence was referred reported favorably of the General Conference action, which report was adopted, and it was resolved:

1. That it is expedient and necessary, and that the Canada Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church do now organize itself into an independent Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada.

2. That we adopt the present discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church as the basis of our constitution and discipline, except such alterations as may appear necessary from our local circumstances.

As there was and had been a good deal of agitation on the subject of "lay delegation," in order to secure the interests of the laity against encroachment, and to produce as great a unanimity as possible, a restrictive rule was passed by the Conference giving a *veto* power to the quarterly meetings in cer-

tain cases, which was thought then to be an endowment of power much greater and more effective than mere circuit representation in the Conference.

Upon the appointment of Rev. W. Case as general superintendent, Bishop Hedding left the chair, after giving some suitable advice and counsel to the Conference. Thus closed the connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, a connection which had been maintained for thirty-seven years, and had been of vast benefit to the Province, for a more self-denying, zealous, and brave class of men are not to be found than were the "rank and file" of the men who planted Methodism in Canada, and stood by it till it could stand alone; and although manifold charges have been made against them, yet are they an ancestry of which the Church in Canada at this day is not ashamed.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, now fully organized, was an independent Colonial Church, free from foreign influence and control, and numbered thirty-nine ministers, eight thousand seven hundred and sixty members, and nine hundred and fifty Indians. Shortly after its independent organization, the act securing to all religious bodies the right to hold property for religious purposes was passed by the Assembly, which was followed by the act securing to all ministers the right to solemnize marriage. In 1829 the "Christian Guardian" was first issued, under the editorial supervision of Rev. Egerton Ryerson, and was not only hailed as an ally to the cause of reform, but it soon rose to the first rank of Canadian journals. Methodism was now in a state of general prosperity. It had secured to itself a leading position, and had, to a great extent, the control of the mind of the country.

Efforts continued to be made for an equitable appropriation of the clergy reserves, in which all classes might impartially and equally participate. Petitions to the king and the Imperial Parliament, as well as to the Provincial Legislature, were numerously signed and frequently forwarded—solemnly and indignantly protesting against the establishment of any State Church in the province. In 1831 the Episcopal clergy addressed a memorial to the king on the subject of the "reserves," containing some reflections upon the Methodist ministers, which led the latter to memorialize the king, for which they were

reprimanded by Sir John Colborne. A parliamentary document, referring to this matter, has the following:

> The explicit and distinct representation on the subject of the Methodist Conference, in their address to His Majesty, cannot be forgotten; inasmuch as it produced a most offensive reply from Sir John Colborne, which caused much excitement and dissatisfaction at the time; and inasmuch as the observations contained in the address on the subject of applying public funds to the support of religious bodies or teachers, and of appropriating the clergy reserves to purposes of general interest, were distinguished with wisdom and truth.

In 1831 the Revs. George Ryerson and Peter Jones visited England in the interest of the Missionary Society, and had an interview with the Wesleyan Missionary secretaries in London in reference to the missions in Canada. The following year the Rev. R. Alder was sent to Canada as the representative agent of the English Wesleyan Missionary committee, with a view to the appointment of missionaries among the British emigrants in various parts of the province, and to complete arrangements for the payment of a certain amount of money annually by the Canadian Government to the English Wesleyan Missionary Society. As soon as the intentions of the London Committee in reference to missions were communicated by Mr. Alder to the Canadian mission board, they at once, in a letter to the English missionary secretaries, deprecated the establishment of rival interests, and stated at length the evils likely to arise from the existence of two bodies of Methodists, of its infringement on the hitherto acknowledged principle that "the Wesleyan Methodists are one body throughout the world," and the desirableness of uniting the means and energies of the two connections to promote the religious improvement of the aboriginal tribes and the new settlements of the country. They also recommended to the Conference the propriety and desirableness of such a coalition with the English Conference as would secure this object. At the Conference in August, 1832, to which the agent of the Wesleyan missionary committee had been invited, the recommendation of the Canadian mission board was concurred in, and a series of resolutions, declaring the importance and desirability of a union between the English and Canadian Conferences, was adopted by the Conference, and the Rev. Egerton Ryerson was sent to

England as its representative. The "Union" was finally consummated in October, 1833, and the united Church assumed the name of "The Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America," which was subsequently changed to that of the "Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada."

By the articles agreed upon, the episcopacy was superseded by an annual presidency, the annual conference became the supreme legislative body, and in other respects the discipline of the Church was made to harmonize with the English plan; the British Conference appointing the president and taking charge of the missions. By this contract a control was given to the British Conference that took away the independence of the Canadian body, and forced it into a position which exposed its motives to imputation and attack, and involved it in years of trouble.

The changes which took place in the government of the Church resulted in a secession, and led to the organization of the present "Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada." A great deal of litigation followed, involving both parties in expense; and although the "Wesleyans" finally succeeded in gaining possession of the property, yet the lawsuits were of great advantage to the "Episcopals." Public sympathy was awakened in their behalf, which contributed much to their prosperity during the first years of their history; and if they have failed to establish their claims to be the original "Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada," either in the courts of law in this country or before the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, it is because facts are against them.

The "Union" happening at a time when the public mind was much agitated on the subject of state grants to religious bodies, and the Conference having taken such a prominent position in opposition to such grants, neither the country nor the Church were prepared for such a course as it had now entered upon. It was evident that other counsels were prevailing than those which guided the body in the years previous to the union. The continued agitation growing out of the determined opposition of the executive to the popular will, as expressed in Parliament, the feeling of dissatisfaction and growing discontent everywhere apparent, and which culminated in the rebel-

lion, wrought injuriously upon the Church. With the government grant to the missions came loss of public confidence, loss of friends, loss of means, secession of members, strife, and contention. After six years of toil, trouble, and conflict, the returns to the Conference of 1839 are five hundred and eighty-six members less than when the Union was consummated, although during the six years previous there had been an accession of over seven thousand.

The intermeddling of the authorities of the British Conference with the local affairs of the province was most unfortunate and disastrous to the quiet of the Church. The doctrine of passive obedience was not likely to be indorsed by a community accustomed to unshackled freedom of opinion; and the attempted interference with the right of private judgment in political matters, and the right to express that judgment by petition, appeal, or remonstrance when necessity arises, was very properly resented by the great body of both ministers and people. The Canadian people were not prepared to submit quietly to the *dictum* of those who knew nothing of the former history of the country, and, finding themselves in conflict with its free thought, could neither apprehend nor appreciate that loyalty which, while it is true to the throne and constitution, can give a determined opposition to an executive or an administrator of the government when their course is unconstitutional, or adverse to the interests of the country. Political difficulties increased. The establishment of the "fifty-seven rectories," followed as it was by civil war and bloodshed; the attempt of the State Church party to confound reform with rebellion, and so turn the circumstances of the country to their own advantage; the discussions on the union of the provinces, and the subject of responsible government; the jealousy, bitterness, and extreme sensitiveness of parties, should have been a sufficient caution to the agents of the English Conference against any interference with the local affairs of the colony, or in any way seeming to ally themselves with a party whose whole history in the province, up to that time, evinced two things—a determination to oppose the progress of Methodism, and to establish a dominant Church in the country, with all the apparatus usually found associated therewith. By this interference they found themselves arrayed against the great

majority of the Church. So long as the "Christian Guardian" was the organ of their views, as it was for several years after the union, they were content; but when in 1838 it advocated the settlement of the "reserves," according to the well understood wishes of the people, exception was taken to its course, and a letter was addressed by the missionary secretaries at London to the lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada, "relative to the position of the Methodists of Upper Canada as to certain ecclesiastical questions," the import of which was, that the interests of the Canadian Church were not to be consulted at all, that the officials at London were only to be dealt with. This was a bold and officious interference with the rights and interests of the membership of the Church, and an ignoring of the rights and authority of the Canada Conference. When the letter was published it received the reprobation it deserved; but the governor acted upon the letter, and when the "clergy reserve" bill was under consideration, in March, 1839, he consulted with the agents of the English Conference, and in the provisions of the bill the Canadian body was completely set aside, no mention being made of them. This state of things justified the Conference at its next session in resolving, "that, in order to prevent such counter representations under any apparently official sanction being made to the government, and in order to secure the proper representation and guardianship of the views and rights of the Church in Canada, the question of the "clergy reserves" be referred to the Book Committee." And although Mr. Alder came from London upon a special Church Establishment mission, yet so strong and unanimous did he find the feeling of the country against both the letter and the interference of the London authorities, that he never introduced the subject at all. The Conference appointed the Rev. E. Ryerson to proceed to England "to advocate and maintain their just rights and interests before Her Majesty's government and the Imperial Parliament in respect to the "clergy reserves."

Shortly after the opening of the Conference Seminary, called the Upper Canada Academy, the Rev. E. Ryerson visited England, and succeeded in procuring a royal charter of incorporation for the institution, and royal instructions to Governor Head to grant, out of the unappropriated revenues

of the crown, £4,100 sterling for its benefit. This grant to the academy led to a difficulty with the governor, and furnished another opportunity for a fresh attack upon the Methodist Church. When Lord Sydenham assumed the government of the province, application was made to him for further aid to the seminary, which led to a correspondence on the part of the representative of the Canadian Conference, in which the financial relation of the two Conferences was brought under the notice of his lordship, who did not hesitate to say that moneys intended for the benefit of the Canadian Church should be paid to the Church in the colony. A desperate effort was now made by Mr. Alder, and those with whom he acted, to secure the absolute supremacy over everything Canadian, so far as Wesleyan Methodism was concerned. In April, 1840, a manifesto, containing a series of resolutions, was sent to the Conference by a part of the London Committee, containing some grave charges against the Rev. E. Ryerson, based upon the letters he had written to the governor; and threatening, that if the Conference supported Mr. Ryerson in his course they should recommend the British Conference to dissolve the union. Accordingly, at the ensuing session of the Conference in June, after three days spent in discussion, Mr. Ryerson was sustained by a majority of fifty-nine to eight. Not only so, but the Conference denied the right of the London Committee to interfere with the Canada Conference in the management of its own affairs, and declared "that for that committee to accuse and condemn a member of the Canadian Conference, and then enjoin upon them to carry their sentence into execution, was an anomalous and alarming precedent." They stated that the Rev. E. Ryerson was their agent, that it was his duty to confer with the governor, and they sent a delegation to England to settle all matters in dispute, and to prevent collision.

The Revs. William and Egerton Ryerson proceeded to England as the representatives of the Canada Conference, but the agents of the London committee arrived some eight days before them, and the matter was settled before the Canadian delegates were heard. Instead of being heard before the British Conference, as they had every right to expect, the sessions of that body were considerably advanced before they

had an opportunity of presenting either the address or the resolutions of the Canada Conference, and even then the case was referred to a committee, whose report was read and adopted on the last day of the session. The report reaffirmed the assumption of power, and the decisions formerly made by the committee; required that the "Christian Guardian should advocate and maintain it is the duty of civil governments to employ their influence and a portion of their resources for the support of the Christian religion;" that Mr. Ryerson and his Upper Canadian brethren should advocate the right of the London Missionary Committee to the government grant, even if its payment should be transferred to the "clergy reserve" fund; further, that they could not be identified with any body over whose public proceedings they had not an efficient direction; and the report recommended the appointment of a committee, which should prepare a detail of the points upon which full satisfaction will be required of the Conference of Upper Canada.

The Canada Conference bowed its head as it recollected the concessions it had made for the sake of peace and unity; but it was not yet prepared to go upon its knees and surrender everything. It had seen many a dark hour; this was the darkest. The delegates returned home; a special Conference assembled in Toronto, at which resolutions were passed repudiating the action of the British Conference, declaring that the claims they put forth are contrary to the letter and spirit of the articles of 1833; that the avowed dissolution of the union on the ground of the non-compliance of the delegation with requirements and assumptions unauthorized by the articles of union was a plain and lamentable violation of solemnly ratified obligations, both to the Conference and the Wesleyan Church in Canada."

Thus abruptly ended a union which, whatever may have been the intentions of its authors, had brought to the Church nothing but loss, except the experience of chastisement. The Canada Conference had conceded one point after another till there was little left worth conceding, yet it would not surrender the control of the body, politically and otherwise, to an irresponsible executive at London. They had suffered too much at the hands of the State Church party to become the

advocates of Church establishments, which, indeed, could hardly have been expected by those who required it of them. "The Union" as Dr. Bunting declared, "had been a mistake;" more, it had been an injury—an injury to the Conference, to the Church, and to the country; and if the body of ministers had any thing to answer for, it was the readiness with which they sought to conciliate the London committee at the expense sometimes of their own consistency. Satisfied now with their own integrity of purpose, they threw themselves upon God and their country, and awaited the time when better counsel should prevail.

The work of division soon commenced. A number of ministers, favorable to the London assumption, seceded from the Conference, and formed the party known as the "British Wesleyans." The agents of the British Conference seized and occupied several mission stations, some of which had been supplied by the Canadian Conference years before the union. Nor was the regular work exempt from their encroachments. Division and strife, derangement and discontent, was the result.

The Conference was supported in its action by the liberal party both in the Church and in the country, and during the six years that followed the secession of the British Conference and the establishment of rival societies, the Canadian Church was successful beyond expectation. Its membership increased over six thousand, and a corresponding prosperity is observable in its finances.

Various offers were made by the Canadian Conference to the British Conference to leave the matter in dispute to an impartial arbitration, but without any effect. In 1846 some circumstances appeared to favor a further attempt to reconcile the two bodies. In Canada many of those subjects which had caused irritation and discord had been settled. The union of the provinces in 1840 had produced many changes; the great question of "responsible government" had received its solution, and the agitation on the "*reserves*" had subsided. At the same time a great change had taken place in the views of many members of the British Conference in reference to the "establishment," as seen in the moral support given to the Free Church of Scotland. In this year also the "Evangelical Alliance" was formed, having for its object, among other things, to discourage envyings, strifes, and divisions. The Revs.

Anson Green and John Ryerson were appointed representatives to the Evangelical Alliance, and also representatives to the British Conference, to propose a plan for the settlement of the difficulties that existed between the two Conferences. At the meeting of the Conference a large committee was appointed, to whom the whole matter was referred, and after a long and prayerful deliberation the basis of a new arrangement was agreed upon; which, having received the approval of the Executive of the Canadian Conference, was sanctioned by the quarterly meetings, as provided for by the Discipline, and accepted and confirmed by the Conference in 1847.

The articles which form the general basis of union do not differ materially in principle from those of 1833. Perhaps they are a little more exacting. The British Conference appoints the president and the co-delegate on the nomination of the Canadian body, while all the acts and doings of the latter body must be sent to the British Conference for their sanction before they are of force. The difficulty of the government grant was settled by a joint application to the Imperial and Colonial authorities, that it might be paid to the treasurers of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in England, a thousand pounds sterling having been secured to the Canadian Conference as an annual grant for its mission work, and six hundred pounds sterling to its Contingent Fund. This arrangement has been faithfully adhered to for now nearly twenty years, although in a financial point of view it is considered that the English Missionary Society are great gainers by the contract. The large amount of commutation money received from the Canadian government upon the settlement of the "reserve" question, with the amount of "arrearages" received in 1847, would at least be equal to the amount of outlay; and further, it should be noted that it is considered by many as rather humiliating to a body of over five hundred ministers, that their acts must be submitted to a Conference four thousand miles distant, which can know but little of the colony or its wants; and equally so that the nomination of the chief officer must be confirmed by the same authority. The magnanimity of the English Conference will one day perceive that the position of inferiority in which the Canadian body is placed is not conducive to its usefulness, nor compatible

with the dignity which Christ has conferred upon his Church. Its true position is that of an independent colonial Church organization—a position which would give it greater influence and breadth, and command more respect.

At the reunion in 1847 there were in the "Canadian Church" 21,749 members, in the "British Wesleyan" 3,032, and on the Indian missions 1,095; total, 25,876. At the Conference of 1866 the numbers were as follows: Ministers, 628; members, 56,759; Sunday-schools, 749; teachers, 6,340; scholars, 45,000; churches and other preaching places, 1,843. In 1861 the census gave the number of adherents as 244,384. In 1854, by an arrangement with the British Conference, the Lower Canada district and the Hudson's Bay Territory were included within the boundaries of the Canadian work; now extending from the Atlantic in the east to the Pacific in the west, and from the St. Lawrence and the lakes to the Arctic Ocean.

Its mission work is extensive, embracing not only the Indian tribes, and the white settlers in the sparsely settled townships, but also missions among the French and German speaking population; in the Hudson's Bay country, and British Columbia; involving an annual outlay of sixty thousand dollars. Its University at Cobourg, under the able presidency of Dr. S. S. Nellis, is doing a good work in giving a liberal and professional education to hundreds of the youth of the Church and of the country. Possessing the confidence of the people, the ministers are in general well and comfortably supported; while the connectional funds for the support of the superannuated preachers and other purposes, to the extent of nearly twenty thousand dollars, are generously furnished.

Of the other Methodist bodies in Canada, "The Methodist Episcopal Church" is the largest. It has three Annual Conferences, two bishops, about two hundred ministers, and twenty thousand members; and its relative influence may be seen in the fact that in 1861 it had 74,142 adherents. It has a collegiate institution under its control, and a periodical, and in some sections of the country it has large societies.

"The New Connection Methodist Church" assumed its present position about 1840, by a union of the Church founded by Henry Ryan in 1829, and the New Connection Methodist Church in England. It has 118 ministers and 8,000 members;

in 1861 it had 29,492 adherents. It also has a periodical and a theological institution.

"The Primitive Methodists" are very numerous in some places, and have about the same number of members as the New Connection, with seventy ministers.

The latter bodies admit laymen to the Conference: the New Connection, in equal numbers; the "Primitives," in the proportion of two laymen to one minister. From this brief summary it will be seen that Methodism has made rapid progress in Canada since 1791. At the present time there cannot be less than nine hundred Methodist ministers, with eighty-seven thousand members, and over three hundred and sixty-seven thousand adherents; and the prospects are that the success of the future will be equal to the achievements of the past.

Art. IV.—EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MINISTRY.

On the question whether or not a thorough classical and theological education should be made a condition of admission to the Christian ministry, we must answer in the negative, and will proceed to give our reasons.

We suppose it will be admitted by thoughtful people generally, that it ought to be the aim of the Christian Church as speedily as possible to convert the whole world, and to train those converted as thoroughly as the means at her disposal will enable her to do. This being admitted, it will follow that the Church must not hesitate to use all the available material in her possession for the accomplishment of these ends. She will naturally send out as ministers the men who can win and train others. This was the case at the first planting of Christianity. The case of the apostles, indeed, was exceptional. They were inspired, and endowed with miraculous gifts. But we know from the New Testament, that wherever they established Churches they also ordained ministers, who became the pastors of the several flocks thus gathered. Indeed, so general was the office of teaching and other forms of ecclesi-

astical ministration in the early Church, that Neander and other high authorities totally deny the existence of a distinct clerical order among the primitive Christians, insisting upon what they call the universal priesthood, or the equal right of all believers to minister in the congregation. We cannot quite agree with this view; but it is still clear that all the available talent was both cheerfully offered and cordially accepted, and it seems quite probable, from the allusions in the New Testament, that no other period of the Church has possessed so large a proportion of ministers as the age of the apostles.

It may be said in reply, that the miraculous gifts at that time in the Church qualified many to preach who without such gifts would have been wholly unfitted for it. We admit that the first flush of pentecostal life in the young Church was very intense; it doubtless carried the whole body of genuine believers up to a high pitch of zeal, and joy, and love, and was crowned with more or less of miraculous energy. But we have no evidence that any except the apostles were favored with an infallible inspiration, or that in their studies or their preaching they had any other aid or inspiration than is now accessible to a faithful and devout pastor. We read that Apollos, an eloquent preacher, and mighty in the Scriptures, preached when he had gone no further in theology than the baptism of John, and that in gaining further knowledge he was assisted, not by miraculous inspiration, but by the instruction of Aquila and Priscilla, persons who had not themselves been long acquainted with the way of life. The aim of the early Church, therefore, was to spread itself as soon as possible throughout the world, and to use for this purpose, as a preacher, every convert who could successfully aid in the work.

The spirit and aim of the early Church in seeking to convert the world as soon as possible, and in using all its available forces to that end, ought to give the key-note to its successors of all ages. Now, without looking at the intervening ages, let us question our own times. Are the several denominations in our own country, for instance, at work according to this idea? Take for illustration the Churches, excepting our own, best known among us—the Episcopal, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian—are they making rapid progress? Are they employing

in preaching the gospel all the available talent at their command? The answer is, that the Presbyterians especially are employing almost exclusively graduates of colleges and seminaries. And the result is, that only the so-called better classes of the people are reached; the masses are untouched by them. The same is true of the Episcopalians. Why is this? Is it because the schools of these Churches do not work fast enough to meet the demand for the poor and ignorant, as well as for the rich and intelligent? Or is it because the educated preacher, turned out to seek a Church, follows his instincts as a scholar and a cultivated gentleman, and seeks to locate his new enterprise in the best neighborhood, and to gather in the class with whom he is in close sympathy? And do the better class of people seek the scholar-pastor as he does them? We answer that all these reasons operate. The schools of these Churches do not supply more preachers than will meet the demand among the better classes; and these educated preachers naturally, and, as we believe, innocently, prefer to cast the lot of their life among people of their own sort. The result, as far as these denominations are concerned, is, that there are no preachers left for the poor and ignorant; they perish for lack of knowledge. No man cares for their souls. Now is there not among these denominations a large number of gifted Christians, not educated in the classical and technical sense, who might become ministers among the masses? Do they not by their restrictive policy compel a large amount of Christian zeal, knowledge, and eloquence to lie dormant, which might be given to the work of the ministry?

But it will perhaps be objected, that these remarks imply a reproach against educated ministers, as though we charged them either with being unfitted by their culture for ministering to the poor and ignorant, or unwilling to condescend to such a work. We mean no reproach. Educated Christian ministers are still men. And although it will happen in the history of the Church that now and then a scholar of high order, like John Wesley, will devote himself exclusively to the poor and degraded, the *rule* will be the other way; like will seek its like; culture and refinement, even in a minister, will gravitate toward culture and refinement, together with the wealth which they generally imply. If we say this is not true,

we at once strip of their Christianity nearly the whole ministry of the other Churches, whose service is given almost exclusively to the so-called better classes. The truth is, that every Christian is as much bound to make sacrifices as the Christian minister, and the minister is as much at liberty to enjoy a comfortable parish as a Christian farmer is to enjoy his rich and fruitful lands.

We do not, therefore, assert that high culture *incapacitates* a man for the work of the ministry among the humbler and ignorant classes; but we do hold that it unadapts him for such a work. There are individual instances of noble self-sacrifice in this respect, but in the majority of cases, by a law of nature which contravenes no law of grace, the minister of high culture will work among the upper circles. We do not say that his Christian culture has dampened in the least his human sympathy for the ignorant. On the contrary, his views of the brotherhood of humanity become clearer, and broader, and tenderer. But while high culture does this for him, it also puts him in a higher plane of thought; it makes him abstract in his modes of discourse, it gives him a horror of coarse manners and coarse speech, of dirty houses, and of coarse and filthy clothing. In a word, while it broadens his theory of human rights, and extends its embrace to take in the race, it works in him a social transformation, an æsthetic taste, which shrinks from and repels the coarseness and ignorance of the lower classes. Knowledge is power, but in itself has no moral character; and one of its results is, irrespective of moral or religious condition, to draw its possessor away from the society of the ignorant, into that which is like itself. And when we find individual instances of the contrary, the rule is only made more obvious and striking by such exceptions.

To add to the force of these remarks, we need only point to the almost total separation in society between the humbler and upper classes. Nay, the very word class determines, so far, the question, and shows how completely they are apart. Nor does this hold only among those who make no profession of religion, and confess themselves worldlings. It is quite as true in the sphere of religion as elsewhere. To say nothing of our having churches, and indeed whole denominations, especially for the rich, look at the social intercourse of Chris-

tians. Does the brother in the splendid mansion invite the brother from the narrow court to his party? By no means. Christians, like others, come together by classes. This is true even of our most pious and benevolent people. And who shall say that this is wrong? Is it not true upon the very face of things, that ignorance and coarseness, brought face to face in the same parlor with culture and elegance, would make intercourse awkward and painful to one party, and shocking and disgusting to the other? And can that which is so natural in the laity, be wholly wanting in the relations between the laity and the ministry?

The ready answer to all this, I know, will be, that the minister's work with his people is official, and that he can do his duty to the coarse and ignorant without seeking among them his society. We will be reminded that we have among us many ignorant people now, whom we visit pastorally, while we seek society among the refined of our flocks. And this is both true and right, although we hear many a sneer and taunt about visits to the rich and neglect of the poor. The social element in the ministry, as in the laity, must have its pabulum. We should perish without appropriate and congenial social intercourse. We must have friends who sympathize with our tastes, else life is drudgery, and the unrelaxed bow will break.

But is not this the most powerful argument for our view? It seems to us it is. It is an admission that it is only the tie of Christian official obligation that binds us to a certain class; that for the purposes of social life we find nothing in them. Does not this speak in favor of a class of ministers who shall be in social sympathy with them?

Indeed, precisely here is to be looked for a large part of the power of the early Methodist preachers, both in England and in this country. There were among them striking men, men of great individuality and eloquence; but the body of them, who did of course the bulk of the work, were plain, and only remarkable for their piety. In their tastes they were with the very humblest classes of the people. They found their society as well as their work among the humblest; they never dreamed of a social isolation from the poor. Even those who by economy of time and labor acquired a measure of culture, made

such achievements after their social habits had become completely fixed.

This remark holds also of the apostles of Christ. Although they were inspired and miraculously aided, these aids came to them not in scholastic isolation, in the midst of the cultured society of a college, training them to a repulsion of the coarseness of humble life; but in the very midst of their poverty, while they were breathing the social and private life of their humble peers. These aids were gifts rather than culture, and were put, so to speak, whole into them, without changing their social or intellectual state. They were plain men before their endowments, and so they were after. They spoke and wrote bad Greek before the day of Pentecost, and so they did after it.

But besides the natural tendency of educated ministers to find their place among the upper classes, there is a question of proportion and fitness not to be overlooked. A thorough scholar is not required to teach a primary school; the alphabet and the multiplication table are not obliged to be taught by Greek and mathematical scholars. To employ such scholars in these first steps of learning would be out of all proportion, and at the same time make very dull work for the teachers. To teach these first elements it will suffice to have an instructor of much humbler pretensions, one who may have an interest in such matters, and whose work would not involve a useless waste. So, too, we conceive it to be in teaching religion to the ignorant classes. Deeply pious men, gifted, strong-minded, the fellows of the people to be served, no better educated than John Nelson, or Robert Strawbridge, or Philip Embury, but flaming with the love of God, and feeling divinely commissioned to preach, will not be too unlearned for the masses, are in near and loving sympathy with them; they have the people's modes of thinking, the people's phraseology and their proverbs, and in the progress of their ministry they will acquire considerable theological lore with which to carry forward the training of those whom they bring to Christ.

The error of the Churches in calling none but educated men into their ministry is not committed by worldly men in filling up the ranks of the secular professions. Notwithstanding the great antiquity of the profession of medicine, the med-

ical colleges do not ask the student whether or not he has graduated at another college; they simply wish to know whether he understands medicine; that is, whether he knows what he is about to profess. The courts which make lawyers ask no questions, before admitting to the bar, about the opportunities of candidates; they only prove them as to their knowledge of law. There is no prying into antecedents and processes; results are looked at exclusively. The question is, Does the candidate know enough of medicine or law to be trusted with the practice? and multitudes in both of these professions rise to eminence without either Latin or Greek, to say nothing at all of the whole college course.

Nor is there sufficient reason for applying a different rule to candidates for the gospel ministry. Valuable as is a regular classical and theological training, much as it must enhance the power of a minister in the community generally, there is no more reason why he should not succeed without a classical education, than why a lawyer or a physician should not. Let him be examined as to whether he has an intelligent view of the divine things to be taught, and whether he has the power effectively to communicate what he knows, and then, with or without culture in the technical sense, let him preach. The Churches around us, while they act occasionally upon this just theory, generally ignore it, and hence they have no ministry for the masses, and no masses to whom to minister. This judgment applies less to the Baptists than to either the Episcopalians or Presbyterians. The result is, that they have come next to ourselves in gathering the masses, and among the colored people of the South are, perhaps, as strong as we are.

We come now to the discussion of the question in its relations to our own Church, that is, to make a special application of these principles to the Methodist Episcopal Church. We need hardly say that when Methodism began, whether in this country or in England, it had a double mission before it. It was called to save the ignorant and besotted masses outside of all Churches, and simultaneously to reanimate the dead forms and dead souls within them. But her first work was with the debauched and ignorant multitudes outside. The Churches at the beginning would not hear. Even Wesley and his educated compeers were excluded from their edifices, much more his lay help-

ers. In no respect was early Methodism more truly apostolic than in the fact that the great body of her preachers were from the common people, converted in a few days at once into Christians and preachers; called from sin and from common employments to holiness and the ministry. True, Wesley himself was educated, but how many of his coadjutors were his peers in this respect? Not ten in all; perhaps not six who gave themselves up to the new form of evangelism. Quite a large number approved, but almost none itinerated. They preferred their glebes, their salaries, and the comforts of home and social life. Now, as before, not many wise or mighty were called. The great upheaval and rejuvenation was to come from the masses; the masses were to be first stirred, and then were to furnish the men by whom the reformation should be effected. And just so sure as plain men, innocent of literature in any high sense, became successful ministers among the masses, leading them to Christ by thousands, and taking good and faithful oversight of their renewed souls in the days of Mr. Wesley, just so sure will similar men be adapted to the same work among the masses in the future.

The Methodist ministry thus formed and gradually improved, but still always by a large majority composed of uneducated men, have carried on their system of evangelism, trained their Churches and clergy, and brought their benevolent enterprises to a pitch of success unequaled by any other Church in the land. Other denominations may have a higher social position, more of individual wealth, more of culture, but in aggregate power we are inferior to none.

Now, such an organization as ours, to outsiders intricate as the rigging of a great ship to a mere landsman, so full of movement, constantly changing its ministers from place to place, whirling a half dozen bishops over the face of the civilized world every four years, running vast printing establishments, and sending out various ecclesiastical opinions in a multitude of books and newspapers—such an organization would seem to be especially liable to change; indeed, it is thought by many to be on the eve of great changes at the present moment. It will be profitable, therefore, to get a just view of the present position of the Church, that existing facts may reveal existing wants.

We stand before the world, then, at this moment a million of members, with some rich people among us, a very large number of people in middling circumstances, and not few of the poor. We have a considerable number of colleges, generally not well endowed, two theological schools, and a few very fine churches, with a great many plain ones. We have a strong hold upon the masses of the people, no doubt because, unlike the other Churches around us, our Church arose from the masses, and our preachers, being of the people, were led to adopt methods of preaching, building, and working, agreeable and attractive to the people. No Protestant Church can for one moment vie with us in popular favor. We have innumerable free churches scattered through our cities, filled with the sturdy working people, presenting an aspect wholly without parallel in other denominations. Our colleges, theological schools, and academies, are yielding to our ministry a small per centum of thoroughly trained classical scholars, mingled with some quite well trained by their own private efforts, and a still larger number who, without Greek or Latin, are good plain preachers and laborious pastors.

With this mingling of college and non-college, of classical and unclassical, of the commonalty and the fashion, we find opposite tendencies in the Church. It is a standing complaint that as our members grow rich, as they mount to refinement and luxury, and enter what is called "society," we are in danger of losing them. If the parents who have made the fortunes abide with us, the children soon drop off, and with the infirmity of the old people our hold upon the family ends. This is an account of hundreds and hundreds of families. This, indeed, is very ungracious, but still very natural. Wealth and culture and fashion have thrown the young people into "society" whose Church relations are with other denominations and not being religious, or having allowed fashion and show to darken the divine life within them, they conform their religious to their social relations. We ourselves are acquainted with almost innumerable cases of just this sort.

But while we are thus losing the rich and refined at one end, are we holding our own with the masses at the other? We verily believe we are not. We do not mean that the poor, like the rich, are leaving us for other communions; but while the

fortunes of our poorer people are improving, and they are tending upward into a more respectable status, we are not filling the places they vacate with fresh recruits from the lower classes. We do not make, as we formerly did, an aggressive war upon the masses. We are in advance of other Churches in this respect, but far behind our former selves. We are therefore losing at both ends of the line. We do not seem to be able to hold our own people when they become rich, nor to attack and conquer the wild crowd as our fathers did.

Now, what is the philosophy of this double trouble, and what the cure? As to our loss of power with the masses, the facts seem to be these: The ministry is growing with us, as well as with other Churches, into a profession. Our young men, even when they are genuinely pious, begin to feel that in getting ready to preach they are fitting themselves for a calling in life in which they may *make themselves useful and respected.* When they enter the ministry they expect to find, for the most part, a station neat and complete, all ready for occupancy, and as soon as they are in Conference they are candidates for better places, in many cases using their friends to procure them calls, not to rougher and harder, but to higher positions. Thus there is a perpetual struggle away from the rough border between the Church and the rude and vicious masses of the world, and up toward respectable places. And although many of the aspirants are doomed to disappointment, their disappointment takes the shape of discontent, and so far eviscerates them of Christian enterprise. In any case, the masses, for whom no one cares, are left further and further behind.

The philosophy of losses among the rich is even more obvious. He that reads may run. If fashion and culture, the fruits of wealth, take our young people of prominent families into other Churches which contain most of the fashionable world, there are some things in our own Church that naturally aid in these losses. Among these may be named the narrowness which objects to handsome churches, and which condemns organs and fine music. But the chief evil, over which the Church might have easy control, is the frequent change of pastors. As men become cultured and refined, they feel more and more inclined to have a pastor of whom they can make a permanent friend and counselor, and they shrink from bring-

ing their families into close relations with any and every man whom the Conference may please to send. It is disagreeable to have it so, and yet many of us have felt sore embarrassment from this source. This system of change keeps up its ponderous roll, until hearts grow utterly callous to all pastoral relations. It is the duty of the Church member to accept with equal cordiality all who are sent; but the heart feels that, however excellent the law which removes an influential and beloved pastor, it violates another law, that, namely, which weaves its sweet threads around the relation of pastor and flock. But painful as this is, it might be endured by the parents, who may be sturdy Methodists. With the young people, however, it is quite different. With the pleasures and gayeties of fashionable society soliciting them away, they have no restraining tie in a faithful pastor whom they have long known and respected. One after another has come and gone, until they have come to think of them as a sort of spiritual vagrants, with whom it is not worth while to become acquainted, and whose presence in the Church, instead of retaining them, is an argument for leaving it.

Now what is the remedy for this twofold evil? Whatever it may be it must meet the demand at both ends. It must not seek to save the rich at the expense of the masses, and it ought not to hold or regain the masses in a way to drive off those who occupy the more favored positions in society. It should be broad enough to cover the whole ground. We must be a whole Church, able to go out into the waste places and hunt and capture wild humanity, and at the same time to move gracefully and attractively in splendid temples and among pealing organs. It cannot be, as it seems to us, that a classical and theological education would meet both ends of this twofold demand. We want more and more thoroughly educated clergymen. Let the colleges and biblical institutes work might and main to furnish them. The demand is not likely to be met in the next hundred years. But if we attempt to make a thorough education a *sine qua non* to the ministry, we at once give up for clerical purposes a vast amount of available talent, to say the least, full as useful in certain spheres as the best scholars, and still fail to retain the wealthy, who are now deserting us. The rich and cultured, as we have

seen, are not leaving us because our best Churches are not supplied with good preaching, but because there is nothing permanent in our ministry to retain them. They want to be allied to a pastor who is, or who may become, a power in the community; to whom they may look up as counselor and friend and guide. And although there are many short terms of service among the clergy of other Churches, it is not so by rule, as it is with us. The rule with them, on the contrary, is to stay as long as may be agreeable to both parties.

We may therefore multiply educated ministers as rapidly as possible, excluding all others from our Conferences, and still make a very slight advance, if any, toward strengthening our hold upon the higher classes. They stand off or leave us because our ministry is impermanent, unknown, and hence not powers in the community; because they lack social status and influence, the very things they themselves are seeking.

Another effect of making a thorough education a prerequisite to the ministry among us, especially while the pastoral term continues limited, would be first of all, and for all time, an utterly insufficient supply of ministers. Having been somewhat familiar with colleges, and intimate with young men in process of education, we give it as our belief, founded upon considerable data, that educated young men, even when genuinely devout, shrink from the prospect of the frequent changes of the itinerancy. Trained in college to liberal and enlarged thought, and lifted above the sectarian prejudices in which they may have grown up, in many cases they conclude that the doctrinal differences between our own Church and others are not of very great importance, that they can do the work of the ministry quite as well in another Church as in ours, and thus escape the itinerancy as at present worked. Here is to be found the secret of our obtaining from so large a number of Methodist colleges so small a percentum of ministers. Besides those who leave our colleges for other Churches, many who start to be trained for the ministry, having too much pride of consistency to unite with another communion, renounce the thought of preaching, and adopt some other calling, induced to such a course purely by their dread of the changes of the itinerancy. But even could the idea of filling the ranks of the ministry exclusively with graduates of colleges succeed,

such is the inevitable tendency of culture to settle itself, to have its fine library and its literary circle about it, and to become an acknowledged power in the community, and such would be its disgust of frequent and arbitrary change, that the itinerancy, in our opinion, would not survive the success of the scheme so much as a half dozen years.

As to the effect of the collegiate and seminary test upon the fate of the masses, we need scarcely discuss it. Under such a system the Church could not get half a supply of ministers, in which case it would be the poor who would suffer. Or if, for argument's sake, we make the admission that the supply of educated ministers would be abundant, the itinerancy would cease. A clergy made up wholly of educated men would inevitably follow the instincts of culture, and establish, like the Churches about us, a settled ministry. In that case the condition of the masses would be hopeless, for they cannot, as things now look, be reached, except by some such system of evangelism as our itinerancy. They will not of themselves seek the kingdom of heaven; they must be sought, not by a sporadic home mission here and there, but by a broad and vital system like our own, throwing the sweep of its seine around a continent, and bringing to the gospel landing bad and good, little and big.

If, then, the test of collegiate and theological education, applied to our ministry, will not remedy our trouble at either extreme, if it will not of itself detain the deserting culture, and promises no increased aggression upon the masses, what is to be done? where is relief to be looked for? We answer solemnly, and in the fear of God, that the first thing to be done is to see to the substantial security of the itinerancy; with it alone can we carry our mission beyond that of other Churches, and be the Church of the masses. If we had only, or even mainly, the rich and high to look after, our task would be simple; we would only need to stop our itinerancy, and quicken and multiply our educational labors. But we have two widely diverse interests to combine in our system: we must do this, and not leave the other undone. As to our work among the masses, we need no change in our laws. We are only called upon to remember the rock whence we were hewn; we must take lessons of our early successes; we must repeat

early Methodism as to ministerial qualifications and calling; we must remember that the imbruted masses are substantially now what they were a hundred years ago, and that, now as then, a converted and deeply earnest man who knows the heart and language of the people, who has read his Bible and a few religious biographies, will speak with the power of our fathers, with the power of the apostles, using perhaps as bad English as they did Greek, but turning their fellows from darkness to light as did Peter and John, and as did John Nelson and Benjamin Abbott.

Is it not manifest that our growing weakness with the masses results from the distance which we are beginning to throw between our ministers and them? Can any other reason possibly be assigned for it? We are as honest as we ever were, but we naturally follow our sympathies and go after our own sort of people. If a rude young man is converted and burns to preach, before he does it you would take him out of his original element, and break the powerful tie which bound him to his fellows. Our view is, that the masses need such men, substantially in the rough, whose sturdy sense shall gather practical Christian lore as their labors proceed, and who shall never know that they have a profession. Fresh out of mines, out of shops, from farms, let them rush, carrying the new life to their lost fellows. In the Conference, and while they are working, do all that is possible to train them. Have circuits in the country and in the suburbs of the cities, where their rude sermons may be licked into shapes of fire by frequent repetition, and let the itinerancy be constantly bringing in at the same door new material, so as always to keep up the vital sympathy between the Church and the lower forms of human life.

If we have lost power with the masses, the English Wesleyans have lost still more signally in the same direction, and precisely because they have gone further astray than we have on the vital point in question. They do not require a collegiate education of their candidates, but they aim to put them all through a theological training. The result is, that they have isolated themselves from the masses from whom they sprung. The great grandsons of the miners and cobblers no longer preach to the progeny of their ancestors. The neglected

classes, however, have happily fallen into the hands of the Primitives, who furnish, along with some highly gifted preachers, a great many just such as Mr. Wesley first sent out. And while the Wesleyans are grieving and blushing over thinned numbers, the Primitives are rapidly waxing. So much for our relation to the evangelization of the masses. For them we must go back.

But how may we remedy the other and opposite evil? How shall we hold our richer and more cultivated members, who are so rapidly gliding out of our communion. We must remember that they too are ours, and that, although we might be able to spare *them*, yet they cannot so well spare us. As we have seen, what they want, and what our Church wants to make it effective among their class, is greater permanence in the ministry. The way to meet this obvious and urgent demand is not to overthrow the itinerancy, but to *liberate* it, *to enlarge its powers.* Let the restriction upon the appointing power, requiring a pastor's removal at the end of three years, be done away, and let every man be removed only when it will manifestly promote the welfare of the Church. The result of course will be, that the able men who can sustain their Churches, and become influential in their several communities, for good, who can take hold of all the great interests of city and country, and shape them for God and man, will remain a longer time, while those of less culture and less power must remove oftener.

If it be objected that this would produce castes in our ministry, we answer, not in any offensive sense, and not in a worse sense than the present rule. We now have a class of men who are kept on circuits all their lives, another class that never get a first rate station, while another class are moved round and round to the best places. This produces grumbling, and may sometimes be unjust, but it is a necessity of our present method. Under the change which we have indicated it might be said that there would be a more permanent and a moving ministry. We answer, precisely so; that is what is wanted to meet the urgent demand of the times; but then all would be under the same law, subject to the changing power at the end of every year, and the aim would be the rational one of moving no minister merely for moving's sake, but only

as often as might be best for the work. Meantime every man in the ranks would have a chance to find the niche for which he might be fitted, and to remain as long as would be best for him and for the people. The restriction upon the appointing power did not exist in the early days of Mr. Asbury, and the General Conference enacted it much against his will. Its removal, therefore, would only be a return to our first position.

In conclusion, we frankly confess that we see no other plan of saving, at once, the itinerancy, the cultured membership, and the masses. This plan will keep our roots down among *the people*, ever vitalizing them with new sap. It will retain our wealth among us, make our colleges thrive as a consequence, and bring us multitudes of educated young men, who cannot become Methodist preachers while the itinerancy keeps its present form.

Art. V.—CLARK AND MATTISON ON A FUTURE STATE.

Man All Immortal; or, the Nature and Destination of Man, as taught by Reason and Revelation. By Rev. D. W. Clark, D.D., one of the Bishops of the M. E. Church. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock.

The Immortality of the Soul, considered in the Light of the Holy Scriptures, etc. By Rev. Hiram Mattison, D. D. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins.

The Resurrection of the Dead, considered in the Light of History, Philosophy, and Divine Revelation. By Rev. Hiram Mattison, D.D. Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins.

What is man, of whom so much is affirmed and denied? Is he the creature of an hour? Is this body his all, the living principle within being only an accessory; or is not this corporeity itself the essence of life, the foundation of all being? In the answering of these and kindred questions skeptics resort to all sources which seem to offer a chance of success in the great debate; and, just as in apostolic and succeeding ages, so now, the defenders of the faith, nothing loth, follow them to

their own chosen battle-ground and there engage them. Unbelievers resort to philosophy, and render a reason for their unbelief; and our respondents, in the above volumes, claim their reasoning to be unsatisfactory, and one of them boldly asserts that philosophy has failed to solve "the problem of life."

It is claimed that the soul is material, and that man has only one nature; that that nature is the result of certain combinations of matter, or a "function" of "matter;" that it is the action of "force," a mere vague something having no head, and no power to inspire or control it. Our authors reply, that the qualities of mind and matter are different; that they do not belong to or inhere with each other; that their properties are quite distinct from each other, and that the possession of them can in no case be reversed. Bishop Clark in his work devotes four chapters to an exhaustive discussion of these points. His first position, expressed in the words "Man, then, is an embodied spirit," (p. 20,) is the key to his argument. In harmony therewith, his first effort is to prove that man has a double nature. Quoting Genesis i, 26, he says: "This certainly means something more than that man was made *an upright . . . animal walking on two feet.*" And in the analysis of the question of organism, and the atomic theory, as presented by materialists, he seeks to prove by facts in the history of individuals, and facts brought to light by scientific research, the unsatisfactory character of any doctrine which does not admit the immortality of the soul. Substantially the same issues are met by Dr. Mattison, but in a way peculiar to himself. The following extract includes much of his argument as against materialism:

> The properties of matter and spirit respectively, are essential characteristics of the respective essences to which they belong. Copper cannot be iron, because it has not the peculiar properties of iron, and has a set of distinguishing properties of its own; and iron cannot be copper for the same reason. So of *matter* and *spirit;* matter cannot be spirit because it exhibits none of the properties of spirit, and has its own distinguishing properties; and spirit cannot be matter, because it has none of the properties of matter, and has an assemblage of distinguishing attributes of its own.—*Immortality*, p. 16.

If the doctrine of the materialists were true, then there must

needs be a harmony of proportion in the developments of body and mind, and the giant in flesh would be a giant in intellect, and the dwarfish be reduced in the same ratio toward idiocy. Yet, unfortunately for the theories of the skeptics, the facts are against them. Every observer of things sees a thousand illustrations of this. Is Howard any the less a general because of the loss of an arm, or was Watts any the less a poet because of deformity and sickness, or Milton any other than the author of "Paradise Lost" because of his blindness? And these instances illustrate in some of its phases the truth of the principle pervading all others; for on every hand are its evidences. The body sleeps; is bound by cataleptic chains; its animation is suspended by accident; but meantime the mind wings its way in miraculous flights after the unseen and immortal. The bodily functions are in a thousand modes diseased, but the mind retains its freshness and vigor. Death creeps on with steady tread; but though the body fails, the soul reveals new strength, and waits impatiently, pluming itself for immortal flights. Bodily adversity, mutilations, come. One has no hands, but possesses an artist's inspiration; and he compels the feet to fill their manual office, and delicately trace on canvas the outlines of his soul's imaginings. Another is blind, but compels the fingerpoints, sore and bloody, to trace on the raised page the glorious doctrines of the Gospel. So in multitudinous ways and instances the something that is within controls motion, begets all action, judges of impressions on all the senses; and under all conceivable disadvantages exhibits such energy and force as unmistakably fixes its claim to an existence at once separate and immaterial.

But do not men die? Are not we all soon to taste of the same cup which has been pressed to the lips of past generations? No one doubts the sad truth; but there is an infinite difference between death as the infidel views it, and the better idea of the Christian. "The nature of death" is the caption of a chapter in Dr. Mattison's first volume, in which, by the statements of Scripture, by argument and illustration, he sets forth the true character of that which every Christian believes to be the necessary, though sorrowful "gate to endless life."

Death will sever the mystic tie that binds the spirit to a material body, and these two essentially different natures will part company till the resurrection morning.—P. 52.

In this argument, and the character of death as presented, the infidel is met on the one hand; and on the other, those who hold an immortality of existence to be contingent on a Christian life on earth. Says Dr. Mattison:

But our immortal existence is not made dependent upon the reception or rejection of salvation through his name. We shall exist forever, whether in happiness through faith in Christ and a holy life, or in misery through a life of sin and the rejection of offered mercy through him the only Saviour.—Pp. 129, 130.

Dr. Mattison finds arguments for our immortality in nature. Things which are very mysterious in themselves, attract but little attention as we become familiar with them. So, with the knowledge God has given us of the future, the rising and setting of the sun, the changes of the moon, the variations of the seasons, with their results, give us intimations of our destiny. From the lowest forms of animal life are gradations, always tending upward, and finding their culmination in man. Each and all of these are perfectly adapted to their several circumstances and conditions, their bodies showing a degree of strength and capability suited to the course of their lives; but the body of man has in itself the testimony of the presence of a higher nature. We infer the character of the occupant from the character of the house; and doing so, in this body, confessedly "infinitely superior" in its character over all others, in this "antetypal existence," are the evidences of a being for whose existence and development eternity is a necessity.

In the bosom of every man, and perhaps most of all in the good and wise, desires spring up unbidden, for the accomplishment of some unreached end, for the realization of some high and noble experiences. And let the results of a life work be ever so grand, the same yearnings exist. So, a Newton, after effecting what no other human intellect ever had, after discovering great truths that have served to bless men, yet found that he was only opening up grander fields of knowledge, and likens himself to a boy playing on the shore, while the great

ocean lay undiscovered before him. So a Herschell, after making discoveries and reaching results in his favorite science which in themselves were amazing, yet panted, up to the last hour of mortal life, to press on in his sublime work; and both of them doubtless, in common with thousands of lesser note, lay down to die with a consciousness that their work was only just begun. The same is true of the holy desires of the servants of God in the work to which they give their lives.

> If man be not immortal; if there be no future state in which these faculties may expand to their full maturity; if the vast ocean of truth is never to be crossed or surveyed, and the unfathomable mines of knowledge to remain forever unexplored, why was he endowed with such capacities and desires—capacities that can never be filled up, and desires that can never be satisfied in this state of existence.—*Clark*, p. 116.

Both authors find strong argument for the immortality of the soul in the lives and experience of men. Not the least of these is found in the fact that, after the body has passed its meridian of strength, the mind "presses onward as if spurning all impediments, and continues her progressive march for years." The cases of Dryden, Newton, Clarke, Wesley, and others are cited, who exhibited unabated powers of intellect long after the period ordinarily fixed for their decay. Bishop Clark refers to cases where, notwithstanding the brain has been to a great extent destroyed, the sufferers retained full consciousness; and gives the testimony of eminent surgeons to the effect that "every part of the brain has been found to be destroyed or disorganized in one instance or another, while yet the individuals have not been deprived of mind, or even affected in their intellectual powers;" and Dr. Mattison eloquently remarks, "And so of the entire body. It is not the soul or any part of it, and may waste and be dissolved without the extinction of that other and higher nature, which is spiritual, indestructible, and immortal."—*Immortality*, p. 224.

The indications referred to above, as being given by the powers of the soul, grow in importance as we note them closely, and especially so, when viewed in connection with their moral bearing. Memory is one of these faculties; the exhibitions of its power are marvelous commonly, and more so still in extraordinary cases. What its limits have been or are,

how definite its grasp, how wide its range, who can tell? The slightest incident suffices to call up the circumstances and events of past years. No idea is obliterated, nothing forgotten. Under the pressure of great exigencies it calls up volumes of words, acts, and experiences in a moment. Give it the occasion, and languages unused and unthought of are recalled; words casually uttered are, after the lapse of years, rehearsed, though they are spoken in an unknown tongue. Even disease serves at times to awaken its powers to an extent unknown before, and unfelt afterward, it may be, during life. While these things show that the past is indelibly fixed on the mind, they likewise indicate that, when a little more latitude shall be given it will reach out to an immeasurable extent, and help to make up the measure of our immortal experiences.

Copious illustrations bearing upon this point are given in each of the works under notice. The reader will be well repaid by the perusal of chapter 15 of Mattison on Immortality; also chapter 14 of Bishop Clark's work.

So, too, the conscience in its workings goes to show that it does not exist for the present alone. Why it should be at all, and why it should possess the characteristics it does, unless it be closely allied to a future full of the results and consequences of the present, it seems impossible to conceive. In the light of the Holy Ghost, given to all, it approves and disapproves, applauds and condemns; though seared over for long years, it will be heard on the first opportunity. As men go down to the grave, and even during active life, it brings peace to some, and unutterable sorrow and horror to others. Would this be practicable if there were no hereafter? Could the soul be guilty of so great a folly, or the Divine Being of so great an act of cruelty, if there was no basis for the peace of the one class, and no cause for the pain of the other?

Very naturally, when dealing with the question under discussion in the light of moral considerations, our authors seek to make special application of the arguments they bring to the hearts of their readers. Neither of them is content to canvass the subject in a metaphysical style alone. The immortality they contend for is to be shared in by those for whom they write; and so, while Dr. Mattison may have succeeded in writing so as that "no one would suspect from their [the chapters,]

form and style that their author was a clergyman," he has *not* succeeded in writing without leaving on his pages the strong impress of his evidently deep desire to save men.

Thus far attention has been given only to the question of the soul's immortality; it remains for us to notice the other great doctrine treated in these works, namely, that of the resurrection of the body. Whether it would be possible, without the aid of revelation, to draw arguments from the analogies of nature looking to the establishment of this doctrine, may or may not be a question; it is very certain that with this aid such arguments abound, and to what use they may be put no one has more fully shown than the mighty Apostle of the Gentiles. As presented by him, they suggest to us this much at least: that while there may be much of mystery attaching to the doctrine, yet that results are constantly being produced in nature equally inexplicable and scarcely less wonderful. The change from day to night, and from night to day again, is symbolic of that which is to be experienced by our body. Death is the night of the body; we lay down in its sleep, to wake again at the sound of the trumpet on the dawn of the coming day of eternity. It is the winter of our bodies, in which, bound by the frosts of decay, they wait the spring-time of the resurrection morning. Our flesh is for us the seed; destined to be sown, and so disappear for a while; but from which, and out of its corruption, comes the incorruption of a bodily immortality. We are now physically in our chrysalis state, but ere long shall burst the bonds of the sleep of death to emerge on the plains of everlasting life. But though there is room enough for argument growing out of these and other analogies, the doctrine is pre-eminently one of scriptural origin. If there is any lack in human reasoning on the matter, it is abundantly supplied by Him who is master of all things and all worlds.

And both authors act upon this idea. The Bible is to them an armory, from whence they draw argument, illustration, and fact in support of the great doctrine which they advocate. Bishop Clark's pages show a quiet, yet exultant confidence in the truth he seeks to present in this light. With Dr. Mattison the case is different. He is an advocate; hence he must overcome the obstacles thrown in his way by any or all who oppose

his cause. He starts out with the statement, "That there is, or is to be a resurrection, we all agree; but in *what that resurrection consists*, and *when* and *how* it shall be accomplished, we are not agreed," and asks, "How shall we arrive at the truth?" The volume on "The Resurrection of the Body" is his answer. But the key to that answer is given in this brief sentence: "All that constitutes and properly belongs to the body at the hour of death, and is essential to its corporeal identity and integrity, will be raised again to life, and will go to constitute the resurrection body."

In the support of this faith he proceeds to array the belief of the early Jews, as it is set forth by writers inspired and uninspired. Like Bishop Clark, he holds that the resurrection of Christ is the pledge of ours, and like him, does not fail to use that glorious fact to advantage. The faith of the early Church is shown by reference to the writings of some of their number, and various other sources of information, and the chapter closes thus:

> From the tombs in which their ashes slumber; from the accusations of their enemies; from the records of their religious synods and councils; and the written vindications of the faith which they have left behind them, but one voice arises; and that is, that whether right or wrong, philosophical or unphilosophical, visionary or scriptural, *they believed in a literal resurrection of the* FLESH, BONE FOR BONE, AND MUSCLE FOR MUSCLE!

The measure of importance he attaches to scriptural testimony in the case, is seen by the fact that five chapters in the volume are devoted specially to its consideration, and the effort to prove it consistent with "the current creed of the Church for eighteen centuries."

It is not to be supposed that a doctrine of such vital importance to the whole system of Christianity would be accepted without criticism, more than that the word of God itself should so escape. Indeed, denials and objections sprang up at the very beginning of the Christian era, and served to call out the inspired vindications of it by the apostles. In Paul's day men were found who taught that the resurrection was already past, and he met them by flatly contradicting their theories.

It is strange indeed, that after the complete vindication of

the doctrine given us in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the selfsame errors should find advocates in modern times. Yet it is happy for the Church now, that, though we have no inspired penman to refute the sophistries of errorists, we have "defenders of the faith," ready to uphold the same banner. The Bible teaches us of one general resurrection. Men tell us that we are to expect multiplied and "spiritual" resurrections. The Bible declares that the resurrection shall be at the last great day; but the reasoning of Prof. Bush and others of his class reads such a day out of existence or prospect; while it is altogether in contradiction of the unalterable facts therein set forth, and among which those connected with the resurrection of Christ are not the least. With other theorists the idea prevails, that of these mortal bodies an undiscovered germ survives the shock of dissolution, too minute even for "our conception," and that serves as a starting point of a new creation. There may be some ingenuity in this theory, but while it obviates none of the supposed difficulties in the case, it suggests many; for if it be true, there can be no resurrection of the "body," as the Scriptures teach. Death, long supposed to be the destroyer of our bodies, fails of its mark, and leaves the beginning of a new body, unaffected and untouched; and this theory, too, is in contradiction of all the teachings growing out of the resurrection of our Lord, and lacks all harmony with the analogies of the Bible. So we understand Dr. Mattison to hold, for after citing such Scripture declarations as "In my flesh shall I see God," "This corruptible shall put on incorruption," etc., as in contrast with the theory just noticed, he says:

> No ingenuity of interpretation can divest such language of its bearing upon the question at issue. Despite all criticism and philosophy, falsely so-called, all such passages point to the grave where the body rests, and teach beyond all cavil that the idea of a new body constructed of elements that constituted no part of the former body, concedes more to the half-taught philosophy and skepticism of the times, than it does to the oft-repeated and unequivocal declarations of the word of God.—*Resurrection*, pp. 208, 9.

It is doubtless true "that we have not as yet attained to the knowledge of those high philosophical principles employed in bringing about the resurrection of the dead." There is room for the exercise of a Christian faith in dealing with the matter;

yet, while we must admit that there are difficulties connected with the doctrine, they are not of such a sort as to require any departure from the plain teachings of Scripture, or to overthrow the hopes of mankind. The promise of the resurrection comes to us from the only source which could give it weight, and that source is *divine;* and though human reason should not succeed in unraveling this mystery, reason in no wise proves that God has excited hopes in our hearts by the utterance of declarations which he never purposed to fulfill.

And yet, while we accept the Scripture doctrine without any qualification, and fondly hope for the day when our own bodies shall be raised, it is in no wise impossible for us to see that all that is essential to their identity may be preserved, while even the supposed difficulties in the case be allowed to exist. The process of waste and decay may go on, the accidents and mishaps of flood and field, and the mutilations consequent upon them, may occur, and the *man* remain the same; for "that only is his which the conscious spirit still pervades and controls." Let all of this be raised and go to constitute the resurrection body, and the case is fully met and every wish realized. What its character may be cannot now be fully understood. It will be a body, not a spirit, or shadow. It is sown a "natural body," it is raised a "spiritual body," relieved from corruption and clothed with immortality. It is "sown in weakness," it is "raised in power;" just as the soul shall expand in the possession of unending life, so shall the power of the body expand in its capability. Such change will doubtless occur as will relieve it from the sensuousness of earth, and the spiritual body be clad with all the attributes needed to fill up the apostolic idea. And so it is easy to perceive how eye and ear, voice and sense, hand and tongue, shall minister to the grand whole of an immortal existence. A body that shall be indestructible, knowing neither hunger nor weariness; with no physical defect to mar its beauty. And into this inheritance no distinctions of race, color, or circumstance shall enter, for every follower of the Lamb shall participate.

The only dark feature in the doctrine of the resurrection, and doubtless the cause of many of the objections against it, is in the terrible prospect it spreads out before those who shall share in the "resurrection of damnation." "Certain it is that

they shall be food for 'the worm that dieth not.' Whatever may be the nature of that body, we know it shall die no more. As the virtue and self-denial of the pure, foreshadow the character and qualities of their redeemed bodies, so the marks of vice once loved and followed on earth must cleave to the lost man through all the future." "This universal and unbending law of divine retribution comprehends, in the wide amplitude of its range, the broadest and latest results in the lifetime of an immortal nature." * But it is a painful subject, and we pass it by with the prayer that we and all may be preserved from so dreadful a fate.

Growing out of the substance of the works under notice, each of the authors discusses questions suggested by the main subject. Bishop Clark devotes sixty-six pages, or about one seventh of his book, to the subject of "the recognition of friends in heaven." Dr. Mattison devotes to it, specifically, one paragraph in the volume on "The Resurrection of the Body." The bishop evidently treats the subject *con amore.* We can hardly resist the impression that some friends, very dear to his heart, have passed over the flood, so fondly does he linger over each phase of the question. We may regret it or be glad of it, but the fact is undeniable, that to a very large extent the hopes of Christian people turn on this point. How it incites them to perseverance in the Christian way; how it inspires the song of the poet and the tongue of the preacher; how largely it enters into funeral discourses; how it melts to tears the people of God as they talk of this prospect! The ground covered by the arguments of Bishop Clark on this point may be briefly stated. It is assumed that reason affords ground for expecting it, because the yearnings of our hearts cannot otherwise be satisfied; that the communion of saints in heaven without it is impossible; that much of the knowledge acquired in this life would otherwise be lost; that it is necessary to the unraveling of the mysteries of this life. Also, that the teachings of the Scripture justify the expectation; for, is not Jesus to be recognized as He "that was slain?" and were not the souls "under the altar" known? Were not Moses and Aaron "gathered unto their people," and did not the rich man and Lazarus recognize each other, and does

* Bishop Clark: "Man All Immortal," p. 302.

not the apostle rejoice in the prospect of being presented with his brethren? The universality of this faith is in support of its truth. Heathens engrafted it in their systems of religion; Christian teachers in all ages, from Cyprian down, have insisted on it, and it has ever afforded to their flocks very much of comfort in the dying hour.

Objections occur: changes, it is said, are to be wrought in us ere the expected morning dawns, of such a sort as to make a bodily resurrection impossible. But though change occurs, the individual remains the same. How many illustrations in point are afforded in this life. If Moses and Elias were recognized by the disciples after the lapse of ages, why may not we recognize those whom we have loved on earth? It is objected, that if this doctrine be true, heaven must have an alloy of pain, for some of its inhabitants will miss the friends they cherished, and who have not gained a home with the blessed. But if we deny the doctrine, does it relieve the case? Better the certainty that assures us of a part, than uncertainty concerning all. We are to reach a higher level of being in the life to come than we occupy here. Brought into the intimate fellowship with God which must ensue on our reaching the home of his saints, we shall share more fully his view of sin and sinners, and may find in the punishment of the lost a new source of praise. Out of belief in this doctrine, influences salutary and precious must come; it will aid us in forming the friendships of this life, and elevate and ennoble such as are formed; will lead us to throw a mantle of charity around the course of others, and to seek for ourselves a condition of religious life, where no roots of bitterness affect our relation to our fellows, while it gilds the passage through the grave with blessed hopes of a renewal of the holy associations of this life in the other world.

Other points incidental to the main question are canvassed. Dr. Mattison gives two very interesting chapters on the millennium, its order and accompaniments, and Bishop Clark one chapter on heaven, while both add such practical remarks at the close, as well as scattered through the pages of their books, as fully prove that the writing has been a source of "heart culture" to the one, and excited powerfully the hopes and desires so eloquently expressed by the other.

The reader, as he passes over the pages of Dr. Mattison's volumes, will scarcely be able to suppress a smile at the doctor's claim to writing a work of a "non-controversial" character. The headings of his chapters, the style of argument, the ground traversed, are all controversial. How can he avoid it? He proposes to make plain to the common reader the grand doctrine of a future life. But nearly every step of the ground has been traversed by the advocates of error; and the doctor has too much courage, and too much confidence in the truth, to evade the objections of an antagonist. So his volumes bristle with sharp, hard arguments, clothed in such phraseology as enchain the mind, and fringed with such eloquence as will draw tears from "eyes unused to weep."

We have sought in these lines to give a digest of the subject-matter of the books, rather than to criticise them, following, in doing so, the disposition of the heart, though with full consent of the mind. To assume that nothing is written in either work which is open to criticism would be foolish, yet the same might be said of any book.

The works bear the stamp of the individuality of the authors. Just as they differ in their physiognomy, so do they in the style of their writing; the one possessing the sharpness of eye and contraction of brow which might be looked for in a theological veteran; the other, the calm and placid look which we unconsciously associate with the writer of the pages of "Man all Immortal." The one deals with the questions considered objectively, the other subjectively. Of a different cast of mind, both work well for the same cause. No error escapes the searching glance, the keen sarcasm, the ready reply, the home thrust, of the one; while the other bears out in the character of his work his own statement, that its germ was a series of lectures to students, whose heads and hearts he so earnestly sought to cultivate in the knowledge and love of the truth. Concerning each of the volumes we join heartily in the prayer written by Dr. Mattison in his first preface, that they "may cheer and encourage the Christian, establish the wavering, console the bereft and sorrowing, convince the unbeliever, awaken the thoughtless and unconcerned, and bring sinners to God."

Art. VI.—THE ORIGINAL PENALTY OF THE LAW.

Erroneous views of the physical and moral condition of man when first created, have ever been the fruitful source of fallacious conclusions respecting the scheme of redemption, and the destiny of the race. We cannot proceed nnderstandingly in an investigation of the Original Penalty of the Law, without first ascertaining, as nearly as possible, the real *status* of Adam, as a physical and moral being, at the time he was placed on trial in the "garden of delights," under the law of his Maker as the rule of his life.

Was Adam created intrinsically immortal? Was he then, as now, subject to mortality and death; or was he exempt from evil, and endowed with immortality? Extreme theories upon this question, such as belong to Pelagianism and Universalism on the one hand, or arise from high-toned Calvinism on the other, have given shape and tone to nearly all our discussions of this subject, and strongly tinged the theology of the Churches since the Reformation. Evidently, an original examination of the doctrines involved in this inquiry is much needed; and he who will give us the searching analysis, from a Methodistic standpoint, and point out the nature of the first probation, with its bearing on the doctrines of Sin, Redemption, and Retribution, bringing to his task the requisite penetration and independence of thought, with patience and skill to set forth the truths which have as yet been but partially developed, and arrange them logically into a system harmonizing with Methodistic faith, will not only contribute toward the establishment of a greatly improved denominational literature, but will subserve the interests of Christianity itself, by showing that whatever difficulty may not be entirely removed, can be located where a sound evangelism can afford to let it remain. The effort of Mr. Watson, in his Theological Institutes, to maintain the idea that the original penalty included a threefold death—that is, a bodily, spiritual, and eternal death—though somewhat plausible, and much followed in our pulpits, is by no means satisfactory. The genius of our ablest writer on systematic divinity was unable to overcome the difficulties with which that notion

was incumbered. Nor will the careful student fail to detect, in that part of the Institutes which treats of the effects of the first transgression, a want of that clearness and consistency which usually characterize the distinguished author, and which are so conspicuous in his discussions of moral government, redemption, and other questions connected with the Unitarian and Calvinistic controversies. His great object was to prove the actual corruption of human nature by the sin of Adam, in opposition to the teaching of Dr. Taylor, and to correct the impression then prevalent, that Methodism was less distinct in its utterances on this point than Calvinism. He therefore aimed his arguments against Pelagian and Socinian representations of human nature from a Calvinistic standpoint, and quoted approvingly from Calvinistic authors. Hence we find him using the Calvinistic phraseology, and leaning strongly toward the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, *to the extent of involving them in liability to eternal punishment for that sin*, guarding only against the imputation of the *act* of disobedience. This leniency toward Calvinistic notions of the imputation of sin, led him to pass slightly over matters of vital importance, and to treat as incidental that which contained the very soul of the great issue before him.

Adam Immortal only by Use of Provided Means—Mortal by Exclusion from Them.

Mr. Watson, however, distinctly repudiated and successfully controverted the Socinian notion, now a prominent feature of Universalism, that Adam was created mortal, and would have died had he not sinned; but we are left in doubt as to whether he regarded him as intrinsically immortal, and therefore incapable of death, in his first estate, or whether he considered his physical constitution as frail and naturally tending to dissolution, so that his continued exemption from death was to be by some special provision of his Maker, on the condition of his continued innocency. Upon this point he says: "Whether Adam, as to his body, became mortal by positive *infliction*, or by being excluded from the means of warding off disease and mortality, which were provided in the tree of life, is a speculative point, which has no important theological bearing." There is, doubtless, something speculative in this, but it is not so clear that it is without im-

portant theological bearing. If Adam was, by his original situation, immortal as to his body, he was incapable of death without a miraculous change in his physical nature; and if his nature was changed by a miracle of divine power, so as to make death possible to him, he became mortal by "positive infliction;" and the penalty of the law, which is supposed to include bodily death, required a miracle in order to its actual enforcement. But if this "positive infliction" did not occur, then Adam, as to his body, was not by nature immortal; and if he was not, his bodily death was only the result of the change in his relation and condition, and *as to his offspring, mortality need not be considered as part of the original penalty of the law*, their only penalty consisting in their being excluded from the preventives of death. With all deference to the author of the Institutes, it is suggested that the nature of the penalty of the law, as affected by the nature of Adam's physical constitution, is a matter of some importance, especially as it will be conceded that *what the penalty of the law originally was, it is now, and ever will remain.* If it involved the dissolution of the body, as a necessary part of the requirement of divine justice, in its application to the first man and the first sin, *it may*, in its final infliction upon the impenitent, *after the resurrection* and the judgment, *carry along with it the same result*, as necessary to the completion of "the second death."

Pelagian View of Original "Natural Mortality" False.

But why do Pelagians, Socinians, and Universalists insist that Adam was created mortal, and, even before the fall, naturally dying, as we know his posterity to be? This is not without a reason—their systems demand it. Having denied the divinity of Christ, and vicarious atonement, it becomes important to them to diminish the magnitude of human guilt; to make out that sin is a very small matter, not deserving much attention as an element in the moral system of the universe, and that it neither required eternal punishment nor a Divine Redeemer to save from its ultimate consequences. Assuming that sin originated in the physical constitution of man as God made it, they argue that the destruction of the body by death will afford exemption from sin, and that separation from

the animal organism is all the expiation the soul needs. Against this easy method of setting aside the necessity of the atonement, both Calvinistic and Arminian writers have contended with eminent success; but in their eagerness to overthrow the heresy of the opposers of hereditary depravity and vicarious atonement, they have undervalued the importance of gaining strictly tenable ground in relation to the nature of Adam and the penalty of the law.

Man's Unconditional "Natural Mortality" not Proved by Science.

The advocates of the "natural mortality" of man appeal to science and natural history for the proof of their doctrine, and then labor to interpret the Scripture in harmony with their notions. Not intending in this paper to follow them in their arguments, it may, nevertheless, be well to notice some of the questions they propound, and to suggest the appropriate answers. A popular writer upon that side proceeds on this wise: "Was animal death produced by sin? We find that certain animals are carnivorous, with teeth and stomachs to consume flesh—animal food. What did they eat in Eden? If no life was destroyed, how did they subsist? Is it said they were herbivorous? Where is the proof? Besides, how absurd that man's sin changed the form of the teeth and stomachs of so large a portion of the creation. But even this bare assumption does not relieve the difficulty, for every leaf cropped by a rabbit or a deer, every spire of grass consumed by a cow or a bullock, every drop of water, sustains countless forms of animalculine life, all of which are destroyed when the grass, the leaves, and the water are consumed. So then, admitting that all creatures that were obliged to eat were graminivorous or herbivorous, and we must admit that not only vegetable but animal lives were destroyed by millions every day." This relates to the theory that *all kinds* of death were caused by the sin of Adam; and to those who believe the death of beasts, birds, and insects was caused by man's disobedience, the difficulty may be left. We believe no such thing, and make no further answer. This writer also appeals to geology to prove that countless millions of creatures lived and died in earth, and air, and sea, long ages before the stratum which we

occupy was created; and then speaks of *man* as follows: "Man possessed teeth and stomach in Eden, and he used them on 'all the trees of the garden.' If he was not subject to decay, and not liable to death, why did he consume food? Why was he gifted with the same organs he now employs? They are now used to put off the day of death awhile. They never had any other purpose." It may be conceded that the organization of animals, and certain facts developed in the science of geology, favor the supposition that death reigned in the animal and vegetable kingdoms prior to the sin of Adam; but this proves nothing in regard to *man*. No attempt is made to prove that any human being died before the first sin was committed, and any argument short of this falls short of the issue.

True Doctrine—Adam's Immortality not Intrinsic but Conditional.

Nor need we assume, as some have done, and as the arguments of our opponents suppose we must, that Adam's body was positively immortal, in order to hold consistently that his death was privatively caused by sin. *There is a difference between a state of exemption from death by the special favor of Heaven, and by special provisions, and one of positive inherent immortality.* The latter would have been incompatible with the probationary character of the life in Eden. It would imply such immunity from ill, and such security against the mutations of time, as belong only to a state of confirmed holiness. This was not Adam's condition. He was not yet confirmed in holiness; *neither was his immortality of body confirmed.* It is sufficient to hold that the constitution of his body, with respect to immortality, corresponded with the condition of his soul with respect to holiness. As he was free from sin, and on trial for a state of confirmed holiness, so was his body exempt from the reigning power of death, and on probation for confirmed immortality. He was not intrinsically incapable of death without a miraculous change of his nature; nor was dissolution a necessity of his being. Though physically capable of it, death had no claim upon him. All God's purposes respecting him could have been accomplished without it. Had he kept the law of his probation, and walked with God during the period of trial, he would have pleased God, as Enoch afterward did, and might

have obtained as honorable a transfer from earth to heaven. And yet, as before said, he must have been *capable* of death. He was organized under the general laws of animal economy. He needed and received nourishment by the appropriation of suitable food. Death was not so far from him that he could not die without a miracle; nor was it so near to him that he could not escape it by obedience. Divine Providence was his security against the destroyer, and ample provision was within his reach to counteract all tendency to weariness, weakness, or death.

Another asks, "If Adam was immortal in his entire nature, how could he die? If one immortal being could sin and die, why not another? Why may not the saints in heaven sin and die again?" It is doubtless true that a being who is immortal in his entire nature is not capable of dying; yet if God should threaten such a being with death, or even with annihilation, in case of disobedience, it is not to be doubted that he could accomplish the threatened punishment by miraculously changing the nature of the offender; for who shall limit the Holy One? But if Adam's immortality was not positive, but only possible, being not yet confirmed, no miracle was required in his case to enforce the penalty, and no miraculous intervention reduced him to mortality. He was a physical being, and as such was subject to specific laws of life and health, the perpetuity of his vigor depending on his conformity thereto, as the continuance and confirmation of his holiness depended on his obedience to God. Had he continued to obey the laws of his being and probation, he might have increased in strength and advanced in virtue until he became invulnerable to the assaults of temptation. Then, confirmed in holiness and immortality, apostasy and death would have been impossible to him, and God would have taken him to heaven. Nor is there any absurdity in the idea that God furnished him food in Eden, with which to ward off all approach of decay, so long as he maintained his holiness. There is no Scripture that precludes it, and the supposition is neither unreasonable nor improbable. God appoints many things to be done by means and second causes that he might accomplish without them. The saints in heaven may not sin and die, because their holiness is confirmed and their probation past. But even they, for aught we know, may preserve their immortal vigor and blessedness by

the use of appropriate spiritual nourishment. We read of "angels' food;" and it may be that the fruit of the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God, and the river of the water of life, proceeding from beneath the throne of God and of the Lamb, symbolize the exhaustless provisions of Infinite Benevolence for the perpetual invigoration of immortal natures. The angels that visited Abraham and Lot consumed food, and so did our Saviour after his resurrection from the dead. These instances, in which immortal beings received nourishment, though extraordinary, are suggestive of the possibility that part of the pleasure of the saved will be found in partaking of heavenly blessings in a way best represented to us by eating and drinking. "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, . . for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters."

The first announcement to Adam that he should return to dust, shows that his dissolution was caused by sin. "And unto Adam God said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Why was the ground cursed for man's sake? Why must Adam live in sorrow and eat by labor? Why must he return to the ground out of which he was taken? *Because* he ate of the forbidden fruit. No other reason is given. "Sin entered into the world, and death by sin." "By man came death."

The account of Adam's expulsion from Eden corroborates this view. It is clearly intimated that in the garden he had access to means for warding off decay, and of perpetuating his existence in the flesh. But now he was doomed to return to dust, and he must go out from Eden, lest he prevent that doom. "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil, and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever;

therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken." Clearly he was removed from the tree to prevent his immortality.

Adam and Eve were now sinners, and subject to mortality. They were sentenced to dissolution, and went forth from the scenes of their former delights, that the dreaded doom might not be precluded. Already must the death-chill have shivered about their hearts, as they cast a last look upon the tree of life, now guarded by the flaming sword. Yet were they not without hope. Blending with the sterner tones of justice, they had heard the voice of mercy, saying, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." This was the first note of redemption. Indirect as was the promise, it darted one ray of light athwart the gloom. Like one star in the firmament overspread with clouds, it lit up their pathway with faith and hope, and sanctified their labor, and sorrow, and death.

The Original Penalty never Fulfilled, but Prevented by a New Probation.

But, waiving further argument, and assuming that bodily death was caused by sin, the question arises, Was this death the penalty intended in the language of God to Adam, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die?" No little obscurity has gathered around this point by *supposing it necessary to interpret the penalty of the law by the facts developed in the subsequent history of the first offenders.* At first thought this would seem to be the proper course, but a little reflection will show its impropriety. The reason is, *the facts developed in their subsequent history did not result from a literal execution of the penalty.* Had the penalty met with no interruption in its course, the history of Adam and Eve, after the transgression, would have been different from their actual history. Had justice seized the culprits, and granted no respite from the rigid demands of the law, their actual experience would have revealed unmistakably the nature of the penalty; but this was not the case. *The penalty was not literally executed.* When they fell, "they found justice hand in hand with mercy." Mercy instituted a *new probation*, in which life was set before them as the gift of God, through "the Seed of the woman." This new trial, of necessity involved the suspension

of the penalty already incurred. Then, the penalty being suspended, as the first result of the redemptive scheme, to make way for the new trial and the operations of grace, it is manifestly improper to interpret the penalty by the facts that followed its suspension. Into this error almost all Calvinistic writers have fallen, and Methodist theologians have not escaped it.

The Original Penalty, therefore, not Identical with the Actual Results.

Those who explain the original penalty of the first offenders, tell us that the death threatened was three-fold—*spiritual*, *temporal*, and *eternal:* that they died *spiritually* the day they sinned; became *mortal;* and exposed themselves to *eternal death.* This statement agrees with what we know of the state of the first sinners after the fall, and expresses the condition of their posterity as probationers, but that it explains the original penalty, seems far from the truth. Men are mortal, dead in sins, and exposed to eternal death, and yet not in a penal condition, but under gracious influences, and within reach of salvation. So Adam's after condition was not strictly penal but probational. On the day of transgression he forfeited all the life he possessed, as well as all he had in prospect; but justice did not enforce the forfeiture, in the form, or to the full extent of his desert. In some sense he died the day he sinned, for sin separated him from the source of life and holiness, and left him morally dead; but grace interposed with quickening power to begin the development of a new life, immediately after the fall; so that while his holiness was lost, and his ability to transmit to his posterity an uncorrupted moral constitution was destroyed, he was not left to the unmitigated working of the deserved penalty. Moreover, the description of the penalty, that represents him as simply exposing himself to eternal death, is unsatisfactory, in that it implies that there was no exposure to that penalty during the first probation; whereas it is more reasonable to suppose his exposure to the whole penalty corresponded with his liability to sin. This language also implies that the first sin did not really incur eternal death, but only endangered the transgressors, making the infliction of this part of the penalty to depend on some

after contingency. Is it not better to say that in this regard the penalty was indivisible? When the first sinners incurred part, they incurred the whole of it; and if they were afterward found with eternal death suspended on conditions, its actual infliction depending on their conduct subsequent to the first sin, that is to be accounted for, not as showing the nature of the orignal penalty, but as resulting from the advent of the remedial scheme, which suspended the penalty already incurred, and raised them to the privileges of a new probation. We must not overlook this new probation. If we do, we shall fail to mark correctly the transition from the covenant of works to the covenant of grace, and be unable to account for the penalty of the law being suspended on conditions to be performed by those who had once incurred its entire force. It is as a fallen being, and yet embraced in the covenant of redemption, and enjoying the probational advantages therein secured, that Adam is the representative of human nature.

The Original Penalty Death or Simple Destruction of Life.

What, then, was the penalty of the first sin? We cannot learn it from the experience of Adam, for he never experienced that penalty; nor can we learn it from the punishment of his posterity, for they are born under the gracious covenant, and secured against the penalty of original transgression. It is, therefore, to all mankind an unexecuted penalty, and can only be learned from the language in which it was expressed. It is all comprised in the word *death.*

This word, in the Scriptures, is used with some latitude and variety of application; but its radical meaning is never disregarded. There are no qualifying terms applied to it in the Bible. Adjectives may be applied to life, because life is a positive something, having a real existence; but death has no positive existence, and no qualities to be expressed by such terms. In theology, adjectives applied to death cannot well be dispensed with, but it is evident that they can only have a relative meaning. It is sometimes said that death is the opposite of life, as silence is the reverse of sound, and rest the reverse of motion; but this fails to give the force of the word. Death

is not only the opposite of life, but the destruction of life. That which never lived cannot die. There may be an existence in a state the reverse of life, without death. The mere absence of life does not imply death, unless in case of something which once lived. The radical idea of the word death is the destruction of life. Then the nature of death must be determined by the nature of the life destroyed. The destruction of vegetable life is vegetable death; the destruction of animal life is animal death; and the destruction of spiritual life is spiritual death. The distinction sometimes made between spiritual and eternal death is a distinction without a difference; for the latter has no different quality from the former, as it destroys no different life, and is only a continuation of the former, the inevitable result of being left unsaved. All death is eternal in the nature of things. This is implied in the fact that it is the destruction, and not the mere suspension, of life. It must be so, unless there is something in it that will destroy itself, and bring back the life it took away. But having only a negative existence, it can have no such power. Stripped of the trappings of fancy, which lively imaginations have gathered around it, death appears without form, attribute, quality, or being. It is an effect, and not an agent. Hence, if death once occur, whether in the vegetable, animal, or spiritual kingdom, it will reign forever unless arrested by divine power in the production of a new life. In this way will the resurrection of the body come to pass, and not by the natural termination of the dominion of death. So the soul, dead in trespasses and sins, must escape the power of spiritual death, not by the natural expiration of death, but by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost. Death never ends of itself. It therefore follows that the death incurred by the first sin was not of temporary character, whether we understand it of the body, or the soul, or both. It was, in its nature, a finality; and if it did not prove such in fact, that was owing to the intervention of mercy in the redemptive system, with remedial agencies for bringing man out of his fall. By this intervention the penalty was stayed; and but for this, the offenders must have died, in the full sense of the word, in the day they sinned. So Adam must have understood it. He evidently looked for a sudden death by the judgment of Heaven, and the penalty enforced would have realized

his saddest fears. He had a soul and a body, each endowed with a life peculiar to its nature. By keeping the law of his probation, his holiness and immortality would have been confirmed. But by sin all was forfeited. The death incurred would have destroyed the life of his soul and body, and thereby cut off all prospective life. It might not have destroyed his being, as we can conceive of the soul existing without its peculiar life, which we deem allied to, if not identical with, holiness; but it would have deprived him of all that is expressed in the phrase "eternal life."

Those who explain the penalty by the after condition of Adam, and hold to a threefold death—spiritual, temporal, and eternal—define the first to be a separation of the soul from God, resulting in loss of spiritual life; the second, a separation of the soul from the body; and the third, the eternal punishment of soul and body together in the future world. We shall not fault these definitions; but if all this was included in the original penalty, it is plain that it never could have been executed upon the first sinners, if they had been left unredeemed. Corporeal death would have separated the body from the soul, and consigned it to the dust; then, how could the soul and body have been united again, in order to suffer eternal punishment together in the future world, without a resurrection? But we know of no resurrection without the resurrection of Christ; and to suppose that God attached a penalty to his law, the literal execution of which required a resurrection, is carrying speculation a little too far. From this difficulty there is no escape, except by abandoning the idea of a threefold death as the penalty.

Phraseology of the Primal Sentence.

Another serious difficulty is encountered in the expression, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The efforts made to harmonize this language with the idea that the penalty was executed on Adam, and yet that he lived to propagate his species, are numerous and familiar. Some say the "day" was a thousand years long; others tell us the offenders became mortal, which was equivalent to death; and others still resort to the marginal reading, "dying, thou shalt die," and suppose they find evidence that the sinners were to

die in one sense the day they sinned, and in some other sense at some other time. The assumption that the day was a thousand years, is gratuitous; the idea that they became mortal, in any sense equivalent to death, or so as to justify the assertion that the threatening was fulfilled, is far-fetched, unsupported, and unsatisfactory; and the resort to the marginal reading affords no relief. If "dying thou shalt die," denoted two deaths, spiritual and temporal, or one of the soul and one of the body, both should have occurred in the day of transgression; and even this view gives no account of the third death, and leaves no room for it. And if "dying thou shalt die" indicated a gradual process of dying, which was to be consummated in actual dissolution, both the process and the consummation should have been completed within the day, in order to meet the force of the language. But all this is unnecessary, and will be seen to be out of place when the redemptive work is rightly brought into view. The better way is to assume that, in view of the provisional redemption, through "the Seed of the woman," God repented him of the evil he thought to bring upon them, and arrested the penalty before its execution, leaving upon them only the consequences of their disobedience. The penalty was a judicial infliction of death that would have ended the probational history of the transgressors, and prevented the development of creation in the positive existence of a conscious offspring. But God purposed that the race should not terminate with the first pair, and provided a ransom; so that when man fell, he found, instead of the literal execution of the penalty, an arm of mercy interposing to arrest the stroke of justice. "Redemption was not an after-thought brought in upon man's apostasy, but a provision" in hand, ready for the emergency; and, as an existing provision, it availed, at the needed moment, to rescue the fallen pair, and to secure a new trial upon terms adapted to their fallen condition. Then why attempt to find the penalty enforced within "the day" at all?

Temporal Evil a Consequence, not the Penalty, of Sin.

This view induces the necessity of distinguishing between the *penalty* and the *consequence* of sin. The law of the state forbids the use of ardent spirits, under the penalty of imprison-

ment. In violation of law a man drinks to excess. The consequence is intoxication, with its ills and incidents, but the penalty is imprisonment. That only is penal which the law affixes to the crime as punishment. A father forbids his child putting his hand into the fire, on pain of correction with the rod. The child disobeys, and thrusts his hand into the fire; the consequence is, the hand is burned, but the penalty is not the burn, but the correction with the rod. Thus the consequences of Adam's sin, in the shape of a blinded understanding, perverse will, and corrupted passions, with actual subjection to mortality, by reason of his separation from the tree of life, remained upon him, and became the heritage of his posterity; but the *penalty*, the direct infliction of death, by the judgment of God, in the day of transgression, was arrested by the timely advent of the covenant of redemption. Hence, death, as it entered into the world by sin, and passed upon all men, comes not upon the race as a PENALTY for Adam's sin, but as a CONSEQUENCE, allowed in view of the remedial and compensating provisions of grace. Hence, also, the pain, privation, weariness, labor, and sorrow, to which the first sinners were subjected, *in consequence* of sin, are not to be regarded as parts of the original penalty, but as elements of the new probation, evil in themselves, but capable of yielding spiritual profit, under the influence of gracious manifestations. And as these evils were to Adam, so are they to his posterity. "Adam begat a son in his own likeness." He transmitted to that son a body tending to dissolution, and a soul naturally void of spiritual life. "We have borne the image of the earthy." Thus bodily death and moral depravity were entailed upon the race by the invariable law of propagation. Adam's sin affected all the human family, not by the imputation of his guilt, for that would have been false and wicked; not as a penalty for his offense, for that would have been unjust and cruel; but simply as the result of their natural descent from him.

Under a rigorous administration of the first covenant, Adam would have had no offspring. The penalty executed would have cut him off without posterity. Calvinistic writers never appreciate this fact. Their views of the imputation of Adam's sin, and of the penalty of the law as implying a threefold

death, including the future punishment of soul and body together, lead them to the assumption that God could have permitted a fallen progeny to be brought into existence, so related to Adam and the first sin, as to be justly liable to everlasting malediction on account of that sin. This assumption is the foundation of the Calvinian doctrine of election. How often we hear it said, that God could have left the whole race to suffer the entire penalty of the law! And how glibly men argue, that, if God could have left all to the misery of their previous state, that is, to eternal punishment for Adam's sin, or for personal offenses unavoidably growing out of that sin, he could leave part to perish, and do them no wrong by saving others! But the underlying assumption is unsound. It has no support in the Scriptures, is contrary to all our conceptions of the character of God, repugnant to every sense of justice, and is a conception worthy the darkest night that ever settled on the Church. In the language of Mr. Fletcher: "As we only sinned seminally in Adam, if God had not intended our redemption, his goodness would have engaged him to destroy us seminally, by crushing the capital offender who contained us all; so there would have been a just proportion between the sin and the punishment; for as we sinned in Adam without the least consciousness of guilt, so in him we should have been punished without the least consciousness of pain."

No Imputation of Sin, nor Eternal Death therefor.

Upon this point Mr. Watson leans too strongly toward Calvinism. He admits the "imputation" of the "legal result" of Adam's sin to his posterity, and allows that "legal result" to extend to bodily, spiritual, and eternal death, and defines the last death to be "separation from God, and endless banishment from his glory in a future state." He defends this doctrine of "imputation" by formal argument, in the following paragraph:

> The justice of this is objected to, a point which will be immediately considered; but it is now sufficient to say, that if the making the descendants of Adam liable to eternal death, because of his offense, be unjust, the infliction of temporal death is so also; the duration of the punishment making no difference in the simple question of justice. If punishment, whether of loss or of pain, be

unjust, its measure and duration may be a greater or a less injustice; but it is unjust in every degree. If, then, we only confine the hurt we receive from Adam to bodily death; if this legal result of his transgression only be imputed to us, and we are so constituted sinners as to become liable to it, we are in precisely the same difficulty, as to the equity of the proceeding, as when that legal result is extended further. The only way out of this dilemma is that adopted by Dr. Taylor, to consider death not as a punishment, but as a blessing, which involves the absurdity of making Deity threaten a benefit as a penalty for an offense, which sufficiently refutes the notion.

This looks very much like an acceptance of the strong ground of the Calvinists, and writers of that school—Dr. Rice, for instance, in his "*God sovereign, and Man free*"—have used it to great advantage. But Mr. Watson, in the next paragraph, denies sympathy with the high Calvinistic view, and softens his doctrine of the imputation of the entire legal result of Adam's sin to his posterity, by considering it in connection with the "evangelical provision of mercy which was concurrent with it." He must not, therefore, be considered the defender of the doctrine that God could justly make the descendants of Adam liable to eternal death on account of his sin, notwithstanding his strong leaning in that direction, in the passage above quoted. Elsewhere, when joining issue with Calvinism, he argues clearly, that but for redemption the posterity of Adam could not have been brought into existence. Having adopted the idea of a threefold death, as the original penalty of the law, and having attempted to explain that penalty by the occurrences in the history of Adam, as if the execution of it had actually taken place according to the literal announcement, it was natural for him to be betrayed into the inconsistency of occupying Calvinistic ground in controversy with Socinianism. We may readily comprehend how a perverted moral constitution and mortal body, as the consequences of Adam's sin, could be entailed on his offspring, born under the provisions of grace, and freed from all imputation of guilt and punishment for that sin; but we cannot see any way in which the descendants of Adam could be made liable to eternal death, because of his offense, without involving a principle that would justify the actual infliction of that penalty upon them, or any portion of them, regardless of their personal conduct. For these admissible consequences there is

an antidote and compensation; but for eternal death there is nothing of the kind conceivable. It is therefore better to avoid the Calvinistic phraseology altogether, than to admit even the "imputation of legal results," to an extent that will allow the possible damnation of any for the sin of Adam. And this becomes imperative, when it is rightly considered that it was by the "concurrent provisions of grace" that the whole posterity of Adam were rescued from seminal death, and placed upon probationary grounds. To them the heritage of depravity and death is not in punishment for Adam's sin; for, however clear it may be that the original penalty included death to the body and soul of the responsible offenders, it must not be forgotten that the anticipated atonement secured the race against personal liability to punishment for any but personal sins. Then, if that security was valid, whatever form of death or evil we inherit, and is to us unavoidable, is an element of our probation, and cannot be regarded as penal. Ours is not a penal condition; for this is not the world of retribution. We are not under a rigid administration of law, but under grace.

Calvinists, with their high notions of divine prerogative and the imputation of Adam's guilt, may consistently hold moral depravity and temporal death to be penal inflictions for original sin, and deem it an act of grace that any are saved from eternal perdition, on the same account; but those who believe the conscious being of the race on earth results from a gracious intervention that contravened the penalty of the first sin, can admit no such ideas. Universalists, also, with their views of present retribution, and imperfect ideas of probation, may find in the announcement to Adam of a life of toil, privation, sorrow, and weariness, an actual punishment for disobedience; but all who believe in a "judgment to come," as the time of rewards and punishments, will look to the future for the infliction of the penalty upon the guilty, and regard the toil, pain, sorrow, and death entailed upon Adam and his offspring, as the substituted probational arrangement of the new covenant, based upon the sacrifice and triumph of "the Seed of the woman."

Nor need we, as Mr. Watson supposed, in denying that the death of the body is a penal infliction for Adam's sin, go to

the opposite extreme, and pronounce it a benefit. Whatever Dr. Taylor may have thought, or whatever others may still think, in regard to death as a necessary result of our formation in the flesh, we ascribe it to sin, and find nothing remedial in it. We place it on a level with a perverted moral nature. But then there is a remedial scheme, whose development was concurrent with the entailment of death, by the operation of which the penalty was arrested, and the new probation secured, and we are born so related to Adam as to inherit from him the evil of depravity and death, and so related to Christ as to derive from him the benefit of grace and life. Therefore death is neither penal nor remedial; for it is not the mere thing of dying that renders it a blessing or a curse. "The sting of death is sin." Considered apart from redemption, it is evil and only evil, as the result of sin; but connected as it is with grace, in the ultimate workings of the remedial agencies of the gospel, it may assume the full character of a blessing. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." This view solves the case of infants, and will vindicate the administration which entails death upon those who cannot, by any act of their own, either incur or avert a penalty, as no other hypothesis can do. They are not subjects of law, and therefore are liable to no penalty, in the proper acceptation of that word; but they are related to Adam, and inherit the evil of that relation, finding compensation in their relation to Christ and redemption through him. A law with an unconditional penalty would be an anomaly in government; but there is no conditionality in the entailment of death upon the posterity of Adam. Death, being but the culmination of the evil of our physical condition, is no more penal than is the sorrow, pain, and sickness which precede its advent. All these are incidents of our mortality; evil in themselves, flowing from the fountain of original sin, yet capable of "working for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," through the redeeming and sanctifying grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The doctrine herein imperfectly set forth, exhibits the sovereignty, holiness, and justice of God, so as not to obscure the milder beams of goodness and mercy. It secures to God the glory of the salvation of all who are saved, and leaves the condemned without excuse. It shows guilty Adam and Eve

snatched from impending death, and spared to propagate their species as a fallen race, while justice and mercy shine with equal radiance, in surrounding them with the helps and hopes of a better covenant. Avoiding the revolting idea that God could impute guilt to those who had no guilt, or punish sin in those who had no sin, it preserves the federal character of Adam, and accounts for the entailment of depravity and death upon the race, in harmony with the strictest conceptions of moral government and individual responsibility.

Art. VII.—THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN.

This establishment has become a matter of public interest. Being peculiar in its origin and policy, it has been the subject of various criticisms. Many, of other denominations, have regarded it with admiration, and sought to emulate its methods and success. It has enjoyed, to a large extent, the confidence and patronage of the people in whose interest it was established, but not as fully, perhaps, as has been imagined. Having always been conservative, radicals of every class have assailed it as inimical to their objects, often to its disadvantage. Some have criticised its operations from personal prejudice, while others have done so from hearty good-will, designing to promote its prosperity. All these things indicate that fuller and more correct information is desirable. This is our apology for the present writing.

The Book Concern is the natural result of measures adopted by Mr. Wesley at an early period in his public career. Undertaking a great and difficult work, with few to assist him, he availed himself of the press to a remarkable degree. Beginning with tracts, he advanced to pamphlets, and from pamphlets to books, until he had swept over the whole field of thought embraced in his comprehensive scheme of usefulness, and become a prominent publisher of religious works. His means of sale were peculiar, like his whole plan of operations. He relied on himself and his co-laborers. Those who desired to preach under his direction, he pledged to the sale of his books and tracts, as he pledged them to strictly ministerial

duties. Thus all his preachers became colporteurs, and were examined from time to time with regard to this part of their duty. "Take care," said he to them, "that every society be duly supplied with books. O why is not this regarded!" To Mr. Richard Rodda, one of his helpers, he wrote, "You are found to be remarkably diligent in spreading the books; let no man rob you of this glory. If you can spread the Magazine it will do good, the letters therein are the marrow of Christianity." To place his motives beyond suspicion, he consecrated all the profits that might accrue to the cause of God and the benefit of his growing societies. Under this arrangement his first missionaries to this country introduced the books wherever they went. But as the work advanced it became necessary to have other books. This, together with the trouble and expense of obtaining supplies from England, led to the issue of various works under individual responsibility, which created some alarm for the unity of the Church. To meet the acknowledged demands of the cause, the Conference of 1789 appointed Rev. John Dickins editor and agent, under the title of Book Steward.. He was also stationed in the only church of the denomination in the city of Philadelphia. Being furnished with no capital to commence the business, he loaned the Concern six hundred dollars of his own money, and proceeded to republish Mr. Wesley's edition of "Thomas à Kempis," a manual of piety, celebrated for its excellence through Christian Europe. The same year he issued the Methodist Discipline, Saints' Everlasting Rest, and the first volume of the Arminian Magazine. In 1790 portions of Fletcher's Checks and another volume of the Magazine appeared. Thus he continued the sole manager of the business until 1797, when the Conference, to assist him and doubly guard its press against any possible impurity, appointed a book committee to determine what should be published. Two years after, Mr. Dickins was called to his reward, lamented by all who knew him, having successfully laid the foundations of an institution which was to be second to no other of the kind in the world. The same year the Rev. Ezekiel Cooper was appointed to fill the vacancy. Under his skillful management the business continued to prosper. In 1804 it was removed to the city of New York, and Rev. John Wilson was appointed Assistant Editor and Book Steward.

Four years later Mr. Cooper resigned, leaving the Concern worth about *forty-five thousand dollars*, the net earnings of nineteen years. Mr. Wilson succeeded him, with Rev. Daniel Hitt as assistant. This year the agents were first released from the responsibilities of the pastorate, and left to give their entire attention to the business, preaching only as they might feel disposed. Mr. Wilson is said to have been an estimable man, a faithful minister, and a skillful agent. He conducted the business faithfully until 1810, when he also died, leaving the Concern in the hands of Mr. Hitt. The General Conference of 1812 appointed him principal, and Thomas Ware assistant; but the business failed to succeed as it had done, not for the want of fidelity in the agents, so much as skill and harmony. In 1816 both were left out, and Joshua Soule and Thomas Mason succeeded them, and by wise management and indomitable energy saved the Concern from sinking under its embarrassments.

Four years after, Mr. Soule was elected bishop, and Rev. Nathan Bangs was appointed to succeed him, with Rev. Thomas Mason as assistant. The Concern was still heavily in debt. Its books were scattered through the country, in the hands of presiding elders and preachers, under a commission arrangement adopted by the General Conference some years before, and the returns were slow and uncertain. The agents saw that something must be done to vitalize the whole system, and immediately brought out several works for which there was a loud call, embracing Benson's Commentary and a new revision of the Hymn Book. Both being re-elected in 1820, they, two years after, rented the basement of the Wesleyan Seminary in Crosby-street, and commenced doing their own binding. This proved so great a convenience, that Mr. Bangs and his assistant, Rev. John Emory, who succeeded Mr. Mason in 1824, purchased the seminary building, and commenced doing their own printing in September of that year. It was during this administration that Dr. Clarke's Commentary was issued, and the unfortunate system of sending out books on commission was abolished. This was a great relief to the Concern, and gave new life to the business. On the 9th of September, 1826, the first number of the *Christian Advocate* made its appearance, and at once became a power for good to the Church. The General Conference of 1828 appointed

Mr. Bangs its editor, and editor of Sunday-school books, which had then become a necessity; Rev. John Emory, principal editor and book agent, with Rev. Beverly Waugh, his assistant. It was during this term that Wesley's and Fletcher's works were published, and the magazine installed as the *Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.* The business so increased that more room was needed, and five lots were purchased on Mulberry-street, and buildings commenced, where the Concern is now located. Mr. Emory having been elected bishop in 1832, Mr. Waugh was appointed principal agent; Rev. T. Mason, assistant; Mr. Bangs, editor of the Magazine and *Quarterly Review*, and of general books; Rev. John P. Durbin, editor of the *Christian Advocate*, and Sunday-school books and tracts, and Rev. Timothy Merritt, his assistant. In September, 1833, the front building on Mulberry-street was completed, and the whole business removed to its present quarters. Every thing went on prosperously until February 18, 1836, when the buildings and stock were consumed by fire, involving a loss of *two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.*

This was a heavy blow, little part of the insurance being collectable, on account of the bankruptcy of most of the companies, occasioned by a recent heavy fire in the lower part of the city. But it excited much sympathy. Meetings were held on this account in various places, and contributions were made to the amount of $89,994 98. This sum, with what was due the Concern, and the amount received from the insurance companies, enabled the agents to commence anew, with a capital, all told, of $281,650 74. Mr. Waugh being elected bishop in 1836, Mr. Mason was elected agent; Rev. George Lane, assistant; Rev. Samuel Luckey, general editor; and Rev. John A. Collins, his assistant. The same agents were re-elected in 1840, with Rev. George Peck, editor of the *Quarterly Review*, and general books and tracts; Dr. Thomas E. Bond, editor of the *Christian Advocate* and Sunday-school books, with Rev. George Coles for his assistant. Of the officers of the Concern since that time nothing need be said, as they and their services are well known to most who will read this sketch. Suffice it to say, that the business has prospered under all of them, with little interruption, except in connection with the Southern secession of 1844, from which it has happily recovered, as will

hereafter be seen. Mistakes have no doubt been made, but it should be recorded to the honor of all concerned, that not a dollar has been lost by the defalcation of its managers from the commencement of the business. That secession was soon followed by lawsuits against the agents at New York and Cincinnati, and resulted in the division of the property under an order of the court, in violation of a principle of law which had been held sacred both in England and in this country up to that time. But the South and slavery were supreme in those days, and the courts were too willing to do them homage. So the decree was passed, and the property delivered, but to little advantage to its claimants, as it was soon scattered and lost.

The Concern has at present four depositories, for which the agents are responsible: one in Boston, Massachusetts, one in Buffalo, New York, one in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and one in San Francisco, California, all doing a good business. It has a valuable store in San Francisco, free from debt, which accommodates its business, and that of the *California Christian Advocate*, with ample grounds for enlargement, and has recently purchased another in Pittsburgh, which it will soon occupy. It publishes a large number of books, embracing Bibles, Commentaries, Hymn and Music books, with over *fifteen hundred* bound books for Sunday-school libraries, besides Catechisms, Question books, and numerous other requisites, embracing nearly *one thousand Tracts*. It publishes also six periodicals; namely, the *Christian Advocate*, *Quarterly Review*, *Sunday-School Advocate*, *Sunday-School Journal*, *Good News*, and the *Northern Christian Advocate*, at Auburn, New York. The sales have gradually advanced, as will appear from the following quadrennial reports:

	Sales in 4 years.	Increase in 4 years.
Reported May, 1852	$653,190 78	$165,968 74
" " 1856	1,000,734 18	347,543 40
" " 1860	1,175,867 29	175,133 11
" " 1864	1,507,873 18	332,005 89

During the last three years the sales have been as follows:

In 1864	$519,488 70
In 1865	617,077 80
In 1866	675,513 19
Total	$1,812,079 69

or, $304,206 51 more than in the *four* years last preceding.

The Western Book Concern was commenced at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1820, as a branch of the parent establishment, under the immediate agency of Rev. Martin Ruter. This was necessitated by the expense and slowness of transportation, and the state of the currency. Mr. Ruter served the usual term of eight years, when the Rev. Charles Holliday was elected his successor. In 1832 Rev. John F. Wright became his assistant. Four years after, Mr. Wright was elected principal, and Rev. Le Roy Swormstedt, assistant. In 1840 they were both re-elected. In 1844 Mr. Swormstedt was elected principal, which office he held *sixteen* years, with Rev. J. T. Mitchell and Rev. J. H. Power, assistants, four years each, and Rev. Adam Poe, eight years. Being entirely disabled by age and infirmities, he was succeeded, in 1860, by Mr. Poe, with Rev. Luke Hitchcock for assistant, who continue to manage the business with fidelity and success.

From a mere depository and a branch, this establishment has grown into a regular publishing house, having *its* branches or depositories at Chicago, St. Louis, and Detroit, and publishing three weekly papers in English, and one in German; one monthly, the *Ladies' Repository;* and the *Sunday-School Bell*, in German; all having a large circulation. They also publish a considerable list of books in English and other languages. Its business is nearly equal to that of the parent Concern, and will probably exceed it in a few years, as the population of the great West shall increase. It owns real estate at Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis, equal to its necessities, estimated at $126,130 99; does its own stereotyping, printing, and binding; and reports a net capital of $402,939 30, all of which has grown out of the profits of the business, except $105,103 56, which it received from the parent Concern in the early part of its history, besides $92,926 61, which it paid the Church South, as before stated, and $70,779 88 paid toward general Church expenses. Its growth will be further indicated by the following schedule of its sales, gathered from its quadrennial and annual reports:

	Sales in 4 years.	Increase in 4 years.
Reported, May, 1856.....	$877,214 68	.....
" " 1860.....	1,127,851 00	$250,636 32
" " 1864.....	1,287,694 36	159,843 36

Its sales since the last report have been as follows:

In 1864	$533,858 36
In 1865	618,735 30
In 1866	628,453 76
Total	$1,781,047 42

or, $493,353 06 more than in the *four* last preceding years.

To complete this outline we need to mention, 1. That, in addition to these publishing houses and depositories, there are several other establishments located at central points, and conducted on private account, which keep a general supply of our works, furnishing ample facilities for their purchase in all parts of the country. 2. That the General Conference publishes *three* other weekly papers by *committees;* namely, the *Pacific Christian Advocate,* at Portland, Oregon; the *California Christian Advocate,* at San Francisco, California; and the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate,* at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. For the management of these papers the agents at New York and Cincinnati are not responsible. The last named has been self-sustaining for many years; the others are improving in circulation, and will no doubt become so. All of them are doing a good work for the country and the Church, and could not well be spared. The editors are appointed by the General Conference; and the publishing committees by the Annual Conference, or Conferences, in whose interests they are severally published. 3. *Zion's Herald,* a respectable and useful paper, published at Boston, Massachusetts, is not owned by the General Conference, yet it is at least semi-official, that body having authorized the bishops to appoint a traveling preacher to edit it. It was issued *two* years before the *Christian Advocate,* when there was *no* official paper; was offered to the General Conference in 1848, when in the flood-tide of its prosperity; is sustained by six Annual Conferences; advertises Book Room and other general Church interests gratuitously; is entirely loyal; and works in perfect harmony with our official papers. Its profits are regarded by the association publishing it as belonging to the Church, and not as their personal property; and dividends were made several years to the Conferences patronizing it.

From this brief historical sketch it appears that the Concern, in all its parts, is strictly a ministerial affair. It was com-

menced by the traveling preachers, exclusively on their own responsibility. They borrowed its first money, and paid it out of their own funds. They have borne its losses, and appropriated its profits according to their own judgment and published policy. They have sued, and been sued at law, and have been otherwise acknowledged by the courts as its veritable proprietors. And they are bound by their repeated pledges to the patronizing public to retain their present connection with it, and carry out the Christian and benevolent objects by which its patronage has been stimulated and secured. These pledges have given the ownership something of the nature of a trust, and trusts are not transferable. Thus it was, and is, and must be, the property of the traveling preachers, to be held and used for ever for the purposes originally contemplated, and repeatedly declared by their action in General Conference assembled. It follows, therefore, that ministers who become traveling preachers in any of the Annual Conferences, by that act, become *partners* to the Concern, and are entitled to all the privileges, and are charged with all the responsibilities, of every other member. They consecrate themselves to the enterprise as really as they do to the itinerant ministry, or to any other prudential arrangement of the Church. It is not optional with them to favor it or not; they are its *owners* and *managers*, and are pledged by solemn contract to every other member and to the whole Church, to commend it, and give personal attention to the circulation of its publications, and the collection of its claims. Not to do so is to neglect duty. To disparage it, and co-operate in measures to circumscribe its business and influence, is to betray a sacred trust voluntarily assumed, except where they are first denied the right guaranteed to them by the compact, which very rarely occurs. If this is not so, then the pledges of our ministers to the Conferences which receive them are a solemn farce. Not in this particular only, but in every other, for they are all given under the same sanctions.

Its object is equally manifest. It is *not to make money*, but *to do good.* This needs to be distinctly understood, for the reason that business men generally judge of its success by the amount of its *profits.* It has been reproachfully said, that if the capital of the Concern were put to interest it would yield more profit than all its business, which has often been true, but

not discreditable to its managers. Indeed, to have published only what promised a liberal profit, and sold it at the usual market price, and thus accumulated an immense fund, would have been to pervert its designs, and entail upon the ministry the just condemnation of the world. This intended *slur* is therefore a compliment, especially when we consider the magnitude of the business done, and the amount of religious reading that has been pushed out into all parts of the country. Many of its issues have been published at a loss, while others have done little better; and yet they have succeeded as well as was anticipated. They were put to press because they were *needed* and would *do good*, and not in any expectation of profits. No outside publisher could have been induced to publish them at all, and especially at the prices at which they have been sold. And much of its present business is of this class. Take, for instance, the Journals of the General Conferences, and the Minutes of Annual Conferences. They are indispensable to our bishops and other ministers, and are published at a very heavy loss. The same is true of many of our Sunday-school and tract works, which come in competition with various benevolent publishing establishments that profess to sell at cost, and often to our certain knowledge sell below cost, and pay expenses and losses out of public collections taken by their agents in the Churches which patronize them. Much of our capital is invested in stock of this kind. Were the Agents to advance the price to a paying point, their customers would go elsewhere for their supplies, though they might expose themselves and their children to the influence of sentiments they do not entirely approve. Besides, a vast amount of business is done in the way of advertising for Conferences and benevolent and educational institutions, for which no charge is made, because they are parts of our grand system of doing good. This is the natural result of the *objects* contemplated, and it is right. We mention the fact merely to show the unreasonableness of the demand for *profits*.

The methods of the business are also peculiar, and need explanation. The circumstances under which it was commenced required them. Public sentiment was opposed to the whole Methodist movement. There were few works in print that were adapted to the emergency, and fewer publishers who

were disposed to invest their capital in the production of more. If anything was to be done, it must be undertaken by those who had "a mind for the work." The people were few and scattered. They knew nothing of the business, and were in no condition to undertake it. The preachers, who went everywhere preaching the word and calling sinners to repentance, felt the need of books and tracts to aid them in their work of reforming public opinions and practice. They knew better than others *what* was necessary, and how to produce it. And, as divinely appointed teachers, it was their business to furnish it, and then to give it the widest and most discriminating circulation. Thus they were in a sense compelled to become publishers and booksellers—colporteurs. And, that they might not personally lose by the operation, it was agreed among themselves that they should be regarded as dealers, and receive the books on credit at the wholesale price. This was wise and business-like. It enabled them to enjoy the personal benefit of the books in their studies, and then to use them in evangelizing the people. The arrangement still prevails, and is carried out with considerable efficiency in some places. If all would appreciate its importance to themselves and the objects of their ministry, it would be regarded with more favor. The power of books and tracts is too well established to be successfully questioned. We seldom hear a Christian experience related which does not make creditable mention of the printed page. This is a sufficient justification of the policy. If Paul became "all things to all men that he might by all means save some," preachers should not be ashamed to sell and circulate books which so often prove the power of God to the salvation of many. If reasons exist why they should not do it personally, they can at least recommend suitable books and papers, and enlist others to do it.

But the plan, however effective when adopted with spirit and energy, is a perfect defeat to the business where neglected. No bookseller will keep our works on sale so long as preachers can purchase a single book at about the same price that he has to pay in laying in a full stock. He naturally concludes that the people will patronize their pastor. If the present incumbent does not supply them his successor will do so, and therefore he avoids this class of stock as unsalable. This is the

reason why Methodist books are not found on the shelves of general booksellers by the side of those of other denominations, so loudly complained of by some preachers, to the discredit of publishers. The fault is not in the publishers, but in the preachers, who accept the privileges secured to them by our system, but neglect the duties in consideration of which those privileges were granted. If the agents were to refuse them the credit and discount they claim, and give it only to dealers, they would not be likely to improve their reputation for enterprise. The two systems, like itinerancy and the settled ministry, cannot work efficiently together. If the Agents rely upon the *preachers*, the booksellers will reject their books. If they will secure the aid of the *booksellers*, they must withdraw or greatly reduce the privileges of the preachers.

These positions are sustained by facts. To test the matter the Agents put their books, several years ago, into the "*trade sales*," the common resort of dealers, and they were uniformly purchased by their regular customers, not by the trade generally. This was conclusive. It has been tested by another method. The Agents publish a class of works for Sabbath-schools, with regard to which preachers have no peculiar privileges, but which they sell to dealers at a moderate discount. These books meet with no difficulty in reaching the general market. Were they to be put at a price that would justify a little larger discount they would go everywhere; but in view of the demand of our people for "*cheap books*," they are kept below the market price.

Looking at the subject in all its aspects, we have no doubt that our old and well-tried plan is the best for us. If faithfully carried out by the preachers, only as our altered circumstances permit, it will bring the books to the people for whom they are especially published, at the lowest price, and introduce them to others with whom they associate.

A business involving so many owners, scattered over our widely extended country, is necessarily attended with *many difficulties*. Though surrendered to the control of a few for the time being, its *seven thousand proprietors* naturally feel that they have a right to advise them in relation to its management, and that their opinions ought to be respected. For the same reasons they feel that they may justly remonstrate when

their Agents come short of, or go beyond what they deem expedient. But not agreeing at all among themselves, they offer so many conflicting opinions that they compel the Agents to follow their own judgment, though it may chance to be in conflict with the convictions of wise and good men, who ardently desire the prosperity of the cause. This sometimes gives offense, and produces criticisms not very creditable to the Agents or to the Concern.

Partners naturally feel, too, that they are entitled to more *indulgence* than others, and ought not to be holden as strictly to business principles in the matter of payment. If not gratified in these notions, they are liable to become alienated, and give their patronage to competing establishments. Agents have always found it necessary to be very careful at these points. But it would be giving them too much credit to say that they have not often given offense. Yet it should be observed that in most cases no offense would have been taken had the transaction occurred in dealing with an independent house.

The fact that so many of the partners are *authors*, is another source of embarrassment. They feel that they are entitled to special consideration, and sometimes fail to appreciate the motives of editors and agents in deciding adversely to their wishes. This has, no doubt, been the real source of some severe animadversions, which have been credited to superior wisdom and enterprise.* Could the *facts* be understood, the damage would not be serious; but to divulge them would be regarded as adding insult to injury. Hence little attempt at reply has been made, and the Concern has been left to vindicate its managers by its unexampled success.

Other embarrassments arise from differences of opinion among the parties in interest. Hardly a month passes in which some *imaginary* improvement is not urged through the papers, as required by the *times*, and indispensable to the honor and success of the cause. The projects and methods of other houses are quoted with laudation, and smart sayings about "*old fogyism*," "the *ruts* of the fathers," and "*sheep binding*,"

* An officer in another similar institution once remarked to the writer, that his committee rejected *nine* in every *ten* manuscripts offered, and generally created *nine* enemies to their business.

often grace the columns of friends, who, if they were to become acquainted with all *the facts* involved, would be the first to oppose their own projects. Cases have actually occurred in which good brethren have defended both sides of the same question! And others would feel obliged to do so were they to take the trouble to inform themselves more fully. But this is nothing strange or new, and there is no remedy for it. The best of men sometimes hastily form opinions, and as hastily express them, and they will do so; but time and better information are great reformers, and will sooner or later win the field.

But notwithstanding these and many other difficulties which have attended the business, the progress of the Concern has been regular and creditable. The fire of 1836 gave it a severe shock, but it soon rallied, and acquired more than its former strength. The division of the Church by slavery took off about one third of its customers, and one half of its real capital; but a few years repaired the damage. It has been heavily taxed to support periodicals in new fields on the frontiers, which its Agents did not start and do not control, and to pay the general expenses of the Church; but it has never failed to respond at sight to every lawful demand. It has witnessed the rise and *fall* of strong and enterprising publishers, with whom its agents and editors have been ingloriously compared, without faltering for a moment. It has competed with a variety of other similar establishments, both denominational and general, and yet has never asked a collection of the Churches, and never received one except in connection with the fire before mentioned. It has passed the financial panics of the last fifty years, before which the mighty have fallen, without the slightest interruption or danger. In the crisis of 1857, when every bank but one, and nearly every publishing house in the city of New York suspended payment, it had gold in its vaults to meet every demand, besides loaning the Missionary Society more than *thirty thousand dollars.* Its credit has been equal to every emergency, no *bank* even asking or receiving an indorser to its paper. It is the largest religious publishing house in the world, and sends forth tens of thousands of volumes that appear to the purchasing public as the issues of other denominations. Yet it has *always been entirely managed by preachers.*

But we shall not do justice to the subject without giving

fuller details with regard to its financial success. With such a beginning and policy, and with so many disabilities, competitors, and disasters, it would have done well had it paid its expenses and reached its present status without performing gratuitous service or making dividends.

It will be remembered that it was started in 1789, under the agency of a preacher stationed in Philadelphia, and on a borrowed capital of *six hundred dollars.* With intervals of depression it continued to prosper until the disastrous fire of 1836, and it paid out large sums from year to year to meet general Church expenses, and aid the superannuated preachers. It is obvious that it adhered closely to its religious and benevolent objects, regarding the question of *profits* as of *secondary* consideration. Hence the injustice of comparing it with private establishments, which are conducted with special reference to financial gain, and are not restricted to any particular class of works. The points of analogy are so few, that such a comparison is unfair. It should be made, if at all, between the Concern and other establishments engaged in a similar work. Making proper allowance for the legacies, donations, subscriptions, and collections received by others, with the view of cheapening their publications, and pushing them into circulation, such a comparison would afford little occasion for mortification. But leaving others to do their own work in their own way, let us examine the facts, and see what the Methodist Book Concern has achieved *financially.*

The exhibit dated March 31, 1836, which was prepared for the approaching General Conference, in less than one month after the fire, states the amount that had been paid out during the preceding four years as follows:

Dividends to Annual Conferences	$48,400 00
Paid to the Bishops	10,450 00
Paid on the expenses of delegates to the General Conference	4,866 00
Total	$63,716 00

This exhibit, taken in connection with other facts already given, and the policy of the Church with regard to the appropriation of the profits, and what we are about to say of the capital on hand, proves that the Concern had been conducted with efficiency down to that time. The same exhibit furnishes the following inventory of all that remained after the fire:

Lots on Mulberry-street	$12,215 00
Remains of recent Building	3,500 00
Stock on hand, embracing Books, Presses, Paper, etc.	19,104 66
Due on Notes, deducting about 7½ per cent. for losses	44,755 79
Due on Book Account, considered good	48,383 31
Cash and Drafts on hand, less donations for rebuilding	23,849 82
Horse and Cart	100 00
Due on Policies thought to be collectable	10,000 00
Stock at Depository at New Orleans, reckoned at probable value	34,808 37
Total	$196,716 95
Less Debts owed by the Concern	5,061 19
Total	$191,655 76
Contributed toward Rebuilding (see Exhibit dated Jan. 1, 1840)	89,994 98
Total Capital	$281,650 74

This is the sum of all the assets of the Concern at that time. And it should be said that the stock and accounts were reckoned at a much higher estimate than they ought to have been, as will be seen by the deduction of only seven and a half per cent. from the notes, which had been accumulating for many years. But we will let it stand as it is, and make our calculations on this basis.

The present Capital of the Concern, (see Exhibit, dated Nov. 31, 1866,) embracing Real and Personal Property at all points, connected with the Concern at New York	$555,359 42
Deduct the Capital found in 1836, as above	281,650 74
And we have a balance of profits in Capital of	$273,708 68
Between 1836 and 1860 the Concern paid in dividends to the Annual Conferences	305,457 00
To the Church South, as per Settlement	231,648 51
" " " " interest on Bond	33,214 02
Cost of Church Suit	9,559 19
Amount transferred to the Cincinnati Branch, by order of General Conference in 1840	105,103 56
Expenses of Delegates to General Conference, and other bills ordered by that body	20,085 72
Paid in the Purchase and Support of Embarrassed Local Papers, so far as ascertained	27,117 31
Paid Bishops' Salaries and Traveling Expenses	180,328 23
Total from 1836 to 1860	$1,186,222 22
Paid between 1860 and 1864, as follows:	
To the Publishing Committee of the *Pacific Christian Advocate*	$6,000 00
To the Publishing Committee of the *California Christian Advocate*	4,000 00

Paid on account of Expenses of Delegates to the General Conference of 1860		$2,478 13
To the Committee on Ritual, and Sundry other Expenses ordered to be paid by General Conference		1,394 71
Paid Dividends to the Conferences		19,600 00
Paid on account of Salaries and Traveling Expenses of the Bishops and to the Widows of Bishops		46,186 69
Total		$1,265,881 75
Paid out from Jan. 1, 1864, to Nov. 31, 1866, as follows:		
Dividends to the Conferences		$20,800 00
On the Pacific and California Advocates		6,000 00
Sundry Expenses ordered to be paid by the General Conference		958 32
On the Salaries and Traveling Expenses of the Bishops and to the Widows of Bishops		59,114 92
Total		$1,352,754 99

Thus it appears that the Concern, starting anew March 31, 1836, with a mixed and uncertain capital, estimated at $281,650 74, has made, in *thirty-one* years, $1,352,754 99, of which $273,708 68, has been added to its capital, and $1,079,046 31, has been paid out in dividends and Church expenses. In other words, that it has added more than *ninety-seven* per cent. to its capital, and paid outside of its business more than *three hundred and eighty-three* per cent. in dividends, etc., making an average profit per annum of $43,637 25, or a fraction less than *sixteen* per cent. on its capital.

These figures relate to the Concern at New York alone. By adding what has been made at Cincinnati, we shall see the aggregate profits of the business at both places, as follows:

Profits at New York		$1,352,754 99
Present Capital at Cincinnati (see Exhibit, dated Nov. 30, 1866)	$402,939 30	
Less Capital furnished by New York	105,103 56	
Total profits in Capital	$297,835 74	
Paid to the Church South	92,926 61	
Paid toward Bishops' Salaries, etc., and General Conference Expenses	70,779 88	
		461,542 23
Making a grand total of profits in both places of		$1,814,297 22

But this showing, gratifying as it is, does not do full justice to the officers of the Concerns, 1. Because the stock with which they commenced in 1836 was overestimated, as before stated.

2. Because the Concern formerly charged most that it paid to bishops, etc., directly to the expenses of the business, which it is now difficult to collect with accuracy. 3. Because the publications and business experiments which have proved most disastrous to the finances, were *ordered* by the General Conferences.

But waiving all these considerations, and others still more important which we deem it inexpedient to name, we ask, What publishing house has been more successful? There are few that were in the book business in 1836 who have not *failed*, or at least suspended, since that time. How many are there to-day worth *one half* the Concern has made and paid out in dividends? How many can boast of so much as the profits of the Concern for a single year? Suppose the most successful of them had been drawn upon annually for dividends, and been obliged to pay over at once nearly one half of its capital, as this establishment did to the Church South, what would have been the result? If private parties have succeeded, it has been by turning their profits *into* their business, whereas the Book Concern has had to turn its profits *away* from its business. Suppose the Concern had retained its profits, and saved at least *one hundred and fifty thousand dollars* interest it has been obliged to pay on borrowed money, and invested them at legal interest, and thus kept them and their proceeds accumulating, what would have been the value of it to-day? We have not found time to make the calculation, nor have we deemed it necessary. But we insist that the few who take it upon themselves to write or speak disparagingly of the management of the business, are bound in all fairness to do it, and state the result.

These showings will no doubt elicit the inquiry which has often been made by leading publishers and others, to wit: "How has all this been done?" We shall not attempt to answer the question fully, as it would require more space than is allotted to us, and lead to developments which expediency would forbid. Still a few suggestions on the subject may be profitable. We answer, then, 1. The Agents formerly obtained better prices, both in regard to the cost of production and the charge for similar books published by others. They could do so, as their issues were mostly of a denominational character, and met with little competition from any source. 2. The sales of many of their publications have been very large, some of

them reaching to several hundred thousand copies. A book at our present prices, of which we can only sell three or four thousand copies, is not financially worth publishing; while, if we could sell *twenty*, *forty*, or *sixty* thousand, it would pay a handsome profit. 3. The Concern has been managed with *remarkable economy*. Its Agents and editors, like its employees generally, have worked for a mere living compensation, which would hardly pay the *carriage* expenses of the owners of other establishments of half its magnitude. Then they have done the *whole business* of stereotyping, printing, binding, and selling, thus producing and circulating their issues at the lowest possible expense. They have done it, too, on Mulberry-street, in the substantial, not showy, but cheap and economical buildings belonging to the Concern, where books can be *made*, and *papers issued*, at as little expense as in any other part of the city. They might have retailed more books in a better location, and in a more costly store, and this might have been to the *honor* of the Church; but the *cost* would have exceeded the gain, as publishers well know that the retail trade amounts to but little to them anywhere. Had they spread out, according to public and private advices, which have been free and abundant, and removed the whole establishment to Broadway, this article had not been written, and the Concern would have been groaning under a debt which neither we nor our children could bear. But let not these remarks be construed as against progress, or the improvement of our accommodations. We go for progress, but can never consent to sacrifice *safety* and *economy* for *show*. This has ruined too many already in all kinds of business, and will ruin others. Had the Concern retained its profits, it might have been on Broadway, or in any other desirable location, and in *splendid buildings*, and been out of debt. But other interests, which have flourished under its fostering care, might have suffered. The policy of the Church in this respect has undoubtedly been wise. Circumstances may require it to be modified so as to leave the business to take care of itself only, but at the present there are serious objections to such a course. We should much prefer that God would influence some rich *man* or *men*, who feel concerned for the honor of the Church, to furnish suitable buildings in the right place, for the accommodation of our publish-

ing, Missionary, Sunday-school, Tract, and other general interests. And this is by no means impossible, or even improbable. If this hope should fail, it would be better that these desirable accommodations should be secured in some other way, and let the old arrangement be maintained. Something will probably be done in the matter before long.

Leaving the past, let us briefly glance at the future. The Concern never had more or stronger competitors than now. Each Christian denomination has its publishing house, its books, papers, etc. Many of them depend largely on collections and donations to furnish buildings, apparatus, and the expenses of its officers. Still, with our facilities, we have little to fear from this source. The Agents will be obliged to sell many of their issues at cost, and even less than cost, or be blamed and forsaken by many of their customers. But this can be endured if the partners, the traveling preachers, will patronize the business as they may and ought to do. But if every conference or two is going to publish a local paper, and the proprietors of the Concern are to use their influence to disparage it and divert its natural patrons to the support of separate and independent establishments, as some are doing, there is just cause of alarm. If it were young and weak they would not do it. They forget that no house can stand, however strong, if divided against itself. Every dollar diverted subtracts just so much from the grand total. One dollar or one man, however, would not make much perceptible difference; but bad examples are contagious, and especially when winked at by those who should reprove them. No other institution of the Church could succeed under this dividing policy. The general and annual conferences, bishops, and secretaries would send forth one united remonstrance against it, if it were to be adopted with regard to the Missionary or any other of our benevolent societies. But here ministers can form alliances, issue their manifestoes, and send out their counter publications, and offer high inducements to partners to betray their voluntarily assumed trusts, and yet they are *petted* and *favored* and *accommodated* and *honored* in their own conferences, and welcomed in others, as though their course was legitimate and fair, and in good faith. And their coadjutors defend them by glittering generalities about the "*freedom of the press*," "*fair*

competition," and "*cheap papers*," as though our Agents and editors were opposed to these things. They are *not* opposed to them. They only insist that *partners*, who enjoy equal privileges with their associates, should redeem their pledges, and *not* give their influence against the business. They believe, too, that to make the competition defended at all fair and honorable, the independent publishers should pay their full proportion of the general expenses charged to the Book Concern, and limit their special efforts to obtain patronage within reasonable geographical boundaries. As the case now stands, the Book Concern pays all the taxes and expenses, and is limited, so far as special efforts are concerned, to a small territory around its place of business, not occupied by other official papers, while these competitors pay nothing, and assume to make a clean sweep over the entire continent. They send forth their tempting offers with little concern as to how much official papers may suffer, provided *they* succeed, while official publishers feel obliged to confine all such efforts within their own patronizing territory. This is one reason why the Agents cannot adopt the methods of private papers in canvassing for subscribers.

We have deemed it proper to state these things thus plainly for the benefit of all parties in interest. Should the policy which has given the Book Concern such remarkable success be maintained by its proper owners and managers, it has a bright future before it. If it is to be repudiated, and every man is to be at liberty to resume his personal right to do as he pleases, without disturbing his relations to the *firm*, we see little ground to hope. If these innovations are right and proper, there are many who would like to share in the profits of them. We hope that our honored bishops, who are the authorized expounders of the Discipline during the intervals of the General Conference, will place the matter in its proper light before the conferences, and in their addresses and sermons on the economy of the Church, which they so highly approve and so often commend to public consideration. We are amazed at the assumptions of some of our copartners. Suppose the company was made up of *six* men instead of *six thousand*, all equally committed to work for its success, and *two* should employ all their talents and influence to get up or carry forward competing establishments on private account, would that be

fair and honest? Such conduct would not be tolerated for a day. No honorable man would risk his reputation in defending it. Is not the principle the same in the present case? We have no doubt of it, and believe that it is generally so regarded. Our danger lies in the few who repudiate their obligations.

A business so complicated, embracing so many branches of trade and manufacture, conducted by so many parties, scattered so widely over the country, requires great unity of action and financial care. It has evidently been guided thus far by a good Providence. May its future be equally influential for good, and creditable to the whole Church.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The Colenso Case—Election of a Successor to Colenso.—In the last number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" we continued the history of the Colenso case until the decision given in his favor, in October, by the Master of the Rolls, (Lord Romilly,) who decided that the trustees of the Colonial Bishopric's Fund were obliged to pay to Dr. Colenso the arrears of his salary, which they had deemed themselves authorized to cut off. About the same time, when this decision was rendered in his favor, the clergy and laity of Natal took the last step for completely severing all connection between themselves and their excommunicated bishop. On October 15 a meeting was convened to consider the replies sent by the Convocation of Canterbury to the queries forwarded through the Metropolitan of Capetown, in 1865, from the Church of Natal, and, in accordance with the advice tendered, to elect a new bishop for the diocese. Fourteen clergymen and about fifty communicants were present. The two clerical supporters of Colenso were present, but not allowed to vote. A letter was read from the Bishop of Capetown, urging the clergy and laity of the diocese of Natal to elect a new bishop; and as regards the mode of election, giving this advice: "The clergy elect, communicants assent. They alone have to do with the matter. All communicants have a right, I apprehend, according to the customs of the primitive Church, to express their assent if they so will." The Bishop of Grahamstown wrote "to express his general concurrence in the views, as to the election of a bishop, contained in the Metropolitan's letter." The discussions extended over two days. The final result was that the clergy present were evenly divided, seven voting for the election of the Rev. William Butler, vicar of Wantage, (of the diocese of Oxford,) as bishop, and seven voting against such election, holding such a course to be illegal, and opposed to the advice of convocation. The dean who presided gave his casting vote in favor of the election. Twenty-eight laymen also voted for it. The dean then pronounced that the Rev. William Butler had been duly elected. The supporters of Colenso made great efforts to keep up an organized resistance. The congregation of St. John's Church, Pinetown, held a meeting, repudiated the election of a new bishop, ejected their incumbent, the Rev. James Walton, for the part he had taken in it, and then called upon Dr. Colenso to appoint a new minister. On the 30th of October another meeting of supporters of Colenso was held at the cathedral of the diocese, at which a protest was moved by the Co-

lonial Secretary, seconded by the Secretary for Native Affairs, and unanimously agreed to. The protest declared that the clergy and laity concerned in this election had, by that act of legislation, renounced the Queen's supremacy, and forfeited their membership of the Church of England. Dr. Colenso, on his part, contended that all persons taking part in conventicles or private meetings to consult on any matter or course impeaching the doctrine of the Church of England, or of the Book of Common Prayer, were *ipse facto* excommunicated in terms of the 75th canon of the Church, and that the dean and his supporters were therefore excommunicated by their own act in electing a bishop without the Queen's authority. The English government had previously instructed the officers of the Crown to observe a strict neutrality in the controversy.

The Ritualistic Controversy.—If there was ever any danger to the Established Church of England involved in the Colenso controversy, it may now be regarded as averted, as Colenso is not supported by any party of numerical importance. The "Ritualistic controversy," on the other hand, is likely to become of greater importance. The interest taken in it by the Church is profound and universal, and the opinion is gaining ground among all the different parties, that this controversy will prove a most dangerous wedge into both the unity and the prerogatives of the Established Church. The "Ritualists," who continue to display the most extraordinary activity, have wisely concluded to conform for the present to the decisions of the Convocation of Canterbury and of the eminent jurists employed by them, both of which have been referred to in former numbers of the "Methodist Quarterly Review." At a recent meeting of the "English Church Union," the central society of the English Ritualists, the following resolutions, which fully define the present position of the Ritualists, were adopted:

1. That inasmuch as the opinions of the counsel consulted by the English Church Union are unanimously in favor of the legality of the Eucharistic vestments, and that a majority have pronounced for the lawfulness of the two altar lights and the wafer bread; while, as to the mixed chalice, the majority are not adverse to it, but rather the contrary, the Union is bound to defend their use if it shall be questioned in the ecclesiastical courts.

2. That the opinions of counsel being unanimously adverse to the lawfulness of "censing persons and things in the course of the service," the Union cannot undertake to defend this practice, unless further information shall warrant counsel in advising that such practice is lawful. But that, inasmuch as the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury have reported to the Upper House not unfavorably of the burning of incense, 'for the twofold purpose of sweet fumigation and of serving as an expressive symbol,' the Union is prepared, if necessary, to defend such a mode of using it as may substantially agree with the report of Convocation, especially as the majority of the legal opinions obtained by the Union do not conflict therewith.

3. That, having regard to the general custom of using very frequently and very variously hymns, anthems, and the like, in connection with the different services of the Church, and considering the fact that Convocation has not objected to the custom, it appears to the Union that attempts to deprive Churchmen of the liberty which this precedent affords ought to be resisted by the Union, if necessity should arise; though the Union must be understood to reserve to itself a discretion as to the mode and nature of the hymnody used, before it could undertake their defense.

Dr. Pusey, who was prevented from being present at this meeting, expressed in a letter his continuing sympathy with the views of the party. Among those who were present was the newly consecrated bishop of Dunedin, in Australia. The new bishop of the important see of Calcutta is likewise reported to be a decided ritualist. But none of all the Anglican bishops is so outspoken in his advocacy of the objects of the ritualistic party as the Bishop of Salisbury, who, in recent replies to protests against ritualistic innovations, fully identifies himself with the party.

From a recent work on the diocese of London it appears that some of the ritualistic practices have been introduced into about one third of the churches, the total number of which is five hundred and fifty-eight. Eucharistic vestments are used in twelve, incense is used in six, and colored stoles are worn by the clergy in three churches, where the eucharistic vestments have not yet been adopted. At ninety-four churches the services are fully choral, at sixty-six partly so. Of the choirs eighty-three

are said to be surpliced, nearly one sixth of the whole, and Gregorian music is exclusively used at thirty-nine. Services are held on saints' days at one hundred and sixty-nine churches, nearly one third; while at ninety of these, or in the proportion of one sixth, there is also daily service.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

CONVOCATION OF AN ASSEMBLY OF ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS AT ROME—SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN ITALY—HIGHLY IMPORTANT MANIFESTO OF THE PRIME MINISTER, RICASOLI.—The Pope has addressed an invitation to the bishops of the Catholic world, to assemble in Rome in June, 1867, to celebrate the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, and the canonization of several martyrs, confessors, and virgins. The pontifical letter of invitation, bearing date the 8th of December, is signed by the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. The meeting may become one of great importance, not so much as a mere gathering of bishops for the purposes pointed out in the pontifical letter, as on account of a formal declaration on the relation of the Roman Catholic Church to the State governments, and on the abolition of the "temporal power," which the assembly of bishops, it is generally expected, will be desired and induced by the Pope to make.

The evacuation of Rome by the French virtually consummates the abolition of the temporal power of the papacy. Although there was no immediate outbreak of a revolution, and although the Italian government makes the utmost efforts for effecting a peaceable solution of the Roman question, it is not doubted that the immense majority of the Roman people are ready to shake off the papal yoke and unite themselves with Italy. The temporal power of the popes has been so closely connected with the State Church system in Roman Catholic countries, that its abolition cannot fail to be soon followed by a radical change in the relations between the Roman Church and the state government. Public opinion has long been preparing for such a change. The liberal party in the Roman Catholic countries of Europe, no less than in the Protestant, is in favor of separation between Church and State, and look more or less upon the American system as a model. It is a curious circumstance that in this important transformation Italy should take the lead. It is the Italian prime minister, Baron Ricasoli, to whom belongs the honor of being the first among the leading statesmen of Europe to have unreservedly recommended the introduction of the American plan. The Italian government has, for several years, given notice that it intended to rearrange the relations of the Church with the State, on the basis of entire independence. These views were more fully developed in a circular addressed by Ricasoli to the bishops who had been exiled, and who had petitioned for permission to return to their dioceses. The Italian government had granted this liberty even before it was asked; and in communicating the decision of his government to the bishops, Ricasoli took occasion to announce that his government was determined to introduce religious liberty as it exists in the United States.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

REVIEW OF THE GREEK AND OTHER EASTERN CHURCHES DURING THE YEAR 1866—INTERCOMMUNION WITH ANGLICAN CHURCHES.—The most important event in the recent history of the Greek and other Eastern Churches, is the increasing interest in establishing closer connections with the Anglican Churches of Europe and America. This increase of interest is, in particular, reported from Russia. In the last number of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" we referred to the account given by the Scottish Bishop of Moray and Ross of his visit in Russia, during which he found the liveliest interest in the progress of intercommunion taken by the Russian bishops and clergy, and by the members of the imperial family. The Rev. George Williams, of England, one of the most ardent champions of the cause of intercommunion, who has lately been traveling in the East, writes on this subject to the Eastern Church Association in England:

The Bishop of Nazareth was perhaps the most hearty in his sympathy of all with whom I conversed, and he repeated more than once, "Your project is the salvation of the world; it is nothing short of that!" The Bishop of Mount Tabor, a most devout man, was deeply interested in the idea of reunion, and it is a comfort to think that prayers are continually ascending from Tabor's lonely peak for the good success of our work. The Bishops

of Horns and Hamah were also warm in their approval, and the last bishop whom I saw, namely, the successor of St. Polycarp at Smyrna, expressed himself most strongly in favor of intercommunion.

In December, 1866, the Patriarch of Constantinople was deposed from his office by the Turkish government, at the urgent request of a large number of the most influential Greeks. The patriarch had made many enemies by excommunicating and imprisoning the editor of a Greek paper in Constantinople, who had been advocating a religious reform. Owing to the great excitement against him, he gave in his resignation, but at the same time induced the Porte not to accept it. As the excitement, however, continued to increase, he was finally forced to abdicate his office. The Turkish government, with which the patriarch had always been on the best terms, gave him a monthly pension of five thousand piastres.

The long struggle between the government of the Danubian Principalities and the Greek Synod of Constantinople terminated, in 1866, in the formal recognition of the entire independence of the Church of the Principalities by the patriarch of Constantinople and his Synod.

The Church in the Ionian Islands at the close of the year still held out against being incorporated with the Church of the kingdom of Greece.

The Russian government, at the beginning of the year 1867, gave its consent to the establishment of a society for the spread of the "orthodox" religion amongh eathens, Mussulmans, and Buddhists in their territory. The operations of the society will be directed in the first instance to the conversion of the pagan tribes in the Altai and Trans-Balkal country, and the counteracting of Mussulman and Buddhist propaganda in those parts. The Caucasus, being assigned to the labors of a special society of the kind, is excluded from the sphere of the present one. New churches were, in 1866, erected with the aid of the Russian government in Tashkent and Khojent, two large cities in that part of Independent Tartary which has recently been annexed to Russia. A new Greek Church will, in the course of the present year, be put up in the city of New York.

It is a curious circumstance, that the Greek Church has of late begun to gain some converts in the countries of Western Europe. The best known of these converts is Abbé Guettée, the author of a "History of the Church of France," (the largest work on the subject,) a "History of the Jesuits," (three vols.,) a refutation of Rénan's *Vie de Jesus*, and many other works. Abbé Guettée, while a Roman Catholic priest, had decidedly Gallican views, and all his works had, on that account, been censured by Rome. Six years ago he founded, in conjunction with the Rev. Archpriest Wassilieff, titular head of the Russo-Greek Church in France, and especially attached to the Russian Church in Paris, a weekly publication, entitled *l'Union Christienne*, and having for its object the union of the non-Roman Churches holding the doctrine of apostolical succession. His latest work, undertaking to prove a schismatic character in the papacy, was published in 1866, and translated at once into English * and Russian.

Another work in defense of the doctrines of the Greek Church was published in England by the Rev. J. J. Overbeck, likely formerly a member of the Roman Catholic communion.

A very interesting movement has recently sprung up in the Armenian Church of Turkey, the origin of which may be traced to the faithful labors of the American missionaries. It is well known that many years ago the American missionaries in Turkey succeeded in organizing a Protestant Armenian Church, which now numbers from ten to twelve thousand members. But it seems that besides those who formally withdrew from the old Armenian Church, and organized themselves into a Protestant community, there were many others, especially in the large cities, who were influenced by the preaching of the Protestant missionaries, although they deemed it preferable to remain in the old Church, and to labor for a Protestant reformation, rather than to build up an independent Protestant Church. This sentiment has shown itself in such partial reforms as the removal of all, or all but one, of the pictures in the churches; in giving free circulation to the Scriptures, and such opposition to saint and image worship as was manifested last year in Smyrna, when the images put into the church by the bishop were destroyed by the peo-

* *The Papacy; its Historic Origin and Primitive Relations with the Eastern Churches.* With an Introdution of Bishop A. C. Coxe, and a Biographical Sketch of the Author. New York, 1867.

ple. In many places, too, ecclesiastics have been found who were bold enough to preach simple evangelical truth. Several years ago the friends of reform organized themselves into a distinct party, calling themselves "The Enlightened." The first move of the party was for a change of the external organization of the Church, and in this they were successful. They prevailed upon the Turkish government to deprive the patriarch of his civil power, vesting it in a committee of laymen, and to give to the Armenians a constitution drawn up in this sense.

More recently the reform party has made a determined effort in favor of a religious reformation. A self-constituted committee has for months been engaged in preparing a reformed prayer-book. This book, which, at the close of last year, was in press, is based upon the old Armenian prayer-book; but it is thoroughly evangelical, and the prayers are in the modern language. It is intended to introduce this prayer-book into the Armenian churches wherever it can be done; but if it cannot be done, the reformers will cease attending the churches, and hold meetings by themselves. It is claimed by those who are well acquainted with the people, that in some parishes nine tenths of the population would favor the introduction of the new prayer-book; but the patriarch, it is expected, will use his whole influence against it, and prevent its introduction.

Among the Nestorians the missionaries of the American Board continue to be successful. According to the annual report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions for the year 1866, there were five hundred and seventy-seven persons in Church communion. There are now seventy-six places of stated preaching, with an average attendance of two thousand five hundred and fifty-nine. The number of native helpers in connection with the mission is one hundred and eleven. Thirty-eight students, fourteen of them from the mountain districts, have been in attendance at the male seminary, and thirty-six at the female. The moral and religious condition of the people is most satisfactory. Late intelligence from the mission gives, however, occasion to fear an interference with the Protestant missions by the English High Church party. Advantage is taken of some dissatisfaction on the part of a few of the mountain helpers. Some of them had gone to be ordained by Bishop Gobat of Jerusalem. As the Protestant missionaries have not organized Churches separate from the old Nestorian Church, and as all the native Protestant preachers receive ordination from the hands of the Nestorian bishops, the Protestant Nestorians are peculiarly liable to be drawn away. Their poverty exposes them to the temptation to accept the larger salaries which are offered, and to secure other pecuniary assistance. The legal position of the Nestorians in Persia was greatly improved in 1866, consequent upon the English intervention in their behalf. When, in a village near Ooromiah, the Protestant Nestorians were ejected by the Roman Catholic party from a church which the former had long occupied, the representative of England in Persia set on foot a subscription to build the ejected Protestants a new church of their own, and this list the Shah himself headed with one hundred pounds. The Shah, also, as a further mark of his favor, appointed General Gehangir Khan, an American gentleman of distinguished merit, to represent the interests of the community.

The Copts of Egypt are greatly benefited by the missionary and educational labors of the United Presbyterian Church of the United States. The schools established by this denomination in Egypt are attended by a large number of Coptic children.

The general condition of the Eastern Churches is likely to be greatly improved by the important political changes in Russia and Turkey. In Russia serfdom has been abolished, and popular instruction is making satisfactory progress, while at the same time the introduction of a representative form of government adds to the education of the adult. The Viceroy of Egypt, in November, 1866, assembled the first Egyptian Parliament, among the members of which were several native Christians, (Copts.) The Turkish government has officially declared its intention to convoke an assembly of representatives of the religious denominations of the empire, in order to secure more effectually to all the enjoyment of equal rights.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Under the superintendence and with the pecuniary support of the Imperial Academy of Vienna, the publication of a new critical edition of the works of the Fathers of the Latin Church has been begun, which will be welcomed everywhere by friends of theological literature as meeting a deeply felt want in our theological literature. The large collection published by Abbé Migne is not only too expensive, but also so devoid of critical accuracy and taste, as to make it almost worthless from the standpoint of literary criticism. The first volume of the new collection, containing the works of Sulpitius Severus, has just been published by Dr. Carl Halm, who has gained a high reputation as editor of several of the Latin classics. (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.* Vol. i. *Sulp. Severi Libri qui Supersunt.* Vienna, 1867.) The editor has carefully examined the manuscripts of the European libraries, and gives, together with a thoroughly revised text, a critical commentary. The next volumes will contain the works of Minutius Felix, Firmicus Maternus, Lactantius, Tertullianus, Hieronymus, (Letters and Polemical Writings,) Augustinus, (*De Civitate Dei.*) A prospectus, giving fuller details of this collective work, can be gratuitously obtained through every German bookseller.

Of the Church History of Alzog the eighth edition has recently been published, (*Kirchengeschichte.* Freiburg, 1867. 2 vols.) This is by far the best compend of Church history from a Roman Catholic point of view, and its completeness of literary references gives to it a general value. The same author has recently published a manual of patrology. (*Grundriss der Patrologie.* Freiburg, 1867.)

Dr. Brischar (continuator of the Church History of Count Stollberg, of a work on the History of the Council of Trent, etc.,) has begun a work on the "Catholic Pulpit Orators of the Three Last Centuries," the first volume of which has just been published. (*Die Kathol. Kanzelredner seit den drei letzten Jahrhunderten.* Schaffhausen. Vol. i. 1867.)

The literature on slavery has received two interesting contributions from Germany, the one from Dr. Wiskemann, professor at the gymnasium of Hersfeld, in Hesse-Cassel, the other from C. Gödel, a prominent clergyman of the Reformed Church of Switzerland. The former (*Die Sclaverei.* Leyden, 1866) is a prize essay, crowned by the Hague Society for the Defense of Christianity. It gives a commentary to every passage of the Bible referring to slavery, refutes the arguments which have been offered by the champions of slavery, and, in conclusion, examines the conditions of the entire disappearance of the evil. The latter (*Sclaverei und Emancipation der sehwarzen Rasse in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerica.* Zurich, 1866) is a comprehensive outline of the history of slavery in the United States, with a full account of the present condition of the freedmen. Both books are favorably reviewed by the German press, and especially the latter, which is published by the "Zurich Committee for the support of the Freedmen," is generally recommended as the best German source of information on the slavery question, and the condition of the freedmen.

Art. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review. January, 1867.—1. Extemporaneous Preaching. 2. The President and Congress. 3. The Greetings of Paul. 4. Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D.D. 5. Notes on Difficult Passages of Scripture. 6. A Lecture on Parish Preaching.

7. Origin and Growth of Episcopacy. 8. New Testament Annotations. 9. The Kuria in the Second Epistle of John.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1867. (Philadelphia.)—1. Introduction. 2. Professional Power. 3. Plato and Platonism. 4. Sermons and Life of Rev. F. W. Robertson. 5. Tischendorf on the Date of the Four Gospels. 6. New England Ecclesiastical Legislation. 7. Is there a Science of History?

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, January, 1867. (Boston.)—1. The Twofold Fundamental Law of Rhythm and Accentuation; or, the Relation of the Rhythmical to the Logical Principle of the Melody of Human Speech. 2. The Divine and Human Natures in Christ. 3. The Art of Conversation. 4. The Province of Imagination in Sacred Oratory. 5. The Topography of Jerusalem. 6. The Atonement in the Light of Conscience. 7. Conscience, its Relations and Office. 8. Biblical Notes.

CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, January, 1867. (Boston.)—1. Erastus Fairbanks. 2. Puritanism. 3. Address at the Laying of the Corner-Stone of the First Congregationalist Church, Washington, D. C., Oct. 4, 1866. 4. The Arrangement of Sabbath Services. 5. Winthrop Church, Charlestown, Mass. 6. Congregational Necrology.

CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW, January, 1867. (Boston.)—1. The Rationale of Imputation. 2. Percival's Life and Letters. 3. The Name and the Number of the Beast. 4. The Resurrection of Christ. 5. The Logical Connections of Sabellianism. 6. The Legacy of the Early Church to Future Generations. 7. Pulpit Oratory. 8. Theology in Politics, an Analytical Illustration. 9. The Praying, with the Anointing, that Saves the Sick; an exegesis. 10. Short Sermons.

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1867. (Dover, N. H.)—1. Life of Moses. 2. Free Communion. 3. Tending toward a Brotherhood, 1866. 4. The Claims of Foreign Missions upon the Churches. 5. Exposition of 1 Cor. xv, 28. 6. Ecce Homo. 7. Our Work in Cities—The Chicago Church. 8. The Sin against the Holy Spirit.

NEW ENGLANDER, January, 1867. (New Haven.)—1. The Temporal Power of the Pope. 2. The Value of Linguistic Science to Ethnology. 3. The Late Insurrection in Jamaica. 4. United States Sanitary Commission. 5. Divorce. Part I.—Divorce among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. 6. A Roman Philosopher.—A Review of an Article on "Conversion" in the "Catholic World." 7. Southern Regeneration.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, January, 1867. (Boston.)—1. When were our Gospels Written. 2. Death and Glory. 3. Pulpit Preparation. 4. Growth and Progress. 5. The Scenes in Eden not a Fall of Man. 6. Unity of Faith. 7. Rénan's Apostles.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, January, 1867.—1. The Education of the World. 2. The American Viri Romæ. 3. The Legal Status of the Southern States. 4. Craftsmen's Associations in France. 5. The Daughters of De Nesle. 6. Mental Physiology. 7. Earl Stanhope's Life of Pitt. 8. The Imprisonment of Davis.

The Southern Review appears the most imposing Quarterly published in the country, not even excepting the North American. Its able editor, Dr. Albert Taylor Bledsoe, is favorably known to our readers as the author of a work of standard value, the Theodicy. It will be a gratifying token for the South, and we trust

for the country, if so magnificent a periodical can be successfully maintained. Its objects are thus stated by the editors:

> We desire this Review to represent the South, not as a party, but as a people. Politics, however, in the highest sense of the word—as gathered from the teachings of history and philosophy—will not be excluded from its pages. The causes and consequences of the late war, and the various questions to which it has given rise, will, from time to time, be temperately discussed; not with the view of awakening acrimonious or vindictive feeling, but of drawing profit from the experience of the past.

The first article, by the editor himself, is a comprehensive view of the doctrine of human progress. The article on Mental Physiology furnishes the best views that science affords of the blending of mind with matter in the constitution of man. There are two historical articles, written with a fresh and attractive pen. The article on the Legal Status of the Southern States is a cool, clear disquisition, written in an eminently judicial spirit. Delicate as is the subject, there is not an incautious word from beginning to end. With its doctrines we cannot of course agree. Its law of treason is such as no government ever held or practiced. The eighth article, touching The Imprisonment of Davis, must, we think, have been inserted by the editor without due examination. It violates at start the announced purpose of the work, that national questions should be "temperately discussed."

English Reviews.

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, January, 1867. (London.)—1. Mediæval Latin Poetry. 2. Works of Edward Irving. 3. The Holy Roman Empire. 4. The Church and the World. 5. The Papal Temporalities —Dr. Newman. 6. The York Congress and the Church in 1866.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Foreign Policy of Sir John Lawrence. 2. Adam Ferguson. 3. The Private Business of Parliament. 4. Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies. 5. Modern Glass Painting. 6. Tenant Compensation in Ireland. 7. Early English Texts. 8. Meteoric Showers. 9. Position and Prospects of Parties.

JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE AND BIBLICAL RECORD, January, 1867. (London.)—1. The Historical Characters of the Gospels Tested by an Examination of their Contents. 2. Karen Traditions and Opinions. 3. "The Coming One," a Meditation. 4. "Elias who was to Come." 5. Difficult Passages in Job. 6. Hymns of the Abyssinian Church, and Prayers. 7. Remarks on the "Eirenicon." 8. Candlemas Day, a Mystery. 9. Two Epistles of Mar Jacob, Bishop of Edessa. Syriac Text.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Charles Lamb and some of his Companions. 2. The Cholera Conference. 3. Books of Fiction for Children. 4. Crime in the State of New York. 5. The Week's Republic in Palermo, 1866. 6. Game and

Game Laws. 7. Ultra-Ritualism. 8. Yankee Humor. 9. English Democracy and Irish Fenianism.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Battle of Sadova, and Military Organization. 2. The Ethics of Aristotle. 3. The Ladies' Petition. 4. Winckelman. 5. Irish University Education. 6. Edmund Spenser. 7. Social Reform in England. 8. Reform and Reformers.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1866. (London.)—1. Froude's Reign of Elizabeth. 2. The Chinese Classics. 3. Ritualism: Past and Present. 4. Shakspeare in Domestic Life. 5. Archbishop Whately. 6. George Eliot. 7. The United States since the War. 8. Bishop Cotton—In Memoriam. 9. Reform.

"Genesis and its Authorship," by Mr. Quarry, (noticed in our Book Table,) is thus characterized:

Mr. Quarry has, we think, done more to demonstrate the independence of science and revealed religion—their sufficiency to their own purposes and their own indefeasible rights—than any recent author with whom we are acquainted. The first dissertation is occupied with the import of the introductory chapters of the Book of Genesis; and after showing the unsatisfactory nature of many recent attempts to harmonize the six days' creation with geological science, the author developes, with much learning, a stream of opinion adverse to the literal acceptation, anterior not only to geological, but even to astronomical discovery, and traceable back even to Old Testament times. The quotations from Calmet, Burnet, Stillingfleet, Henry More, Lord Bacon, the venerable Bede, St. Augustine, Origen, Irenæus, Josephus, Aquila, "show that long before geology, or even modern astronomy, presented the difficulties that of late years have perplexed believers, and afforded a fancied triumph to the infidel, there were those who saw abundant difficulties in the way of a literal acceptation of the Mosaic statements, who could yet be profound believers in the divine inspiration of Holy Scripture and of this part in particular." The hint which Mr. Quarry takes from some of these "burning and shining lights" in the Church of Christ is, that the conception of time, and the mention of successive days, are natural and impressive hieroglyphs to denote a *principle of classification* for all created things, which are thus in six great categories declared to be the product of the creative Word. A grand triad of elements is thus presented as having issued from the word and thought of the Almighty: (1.) Light, with its correlative heat. (2.) Water in its aerial and liquid form. (3.) The solid earth. These *αρχαι*, or *στοιχεια* of the universe, the inspired writer proceeds to people, as it were, with their appropriate occupants. The element of light becomes occupied by the heavenly luminaries, and afterward in order, the water, air, and earth are respectively peopled with fishes and fowls, with vegetable, animal, and human life. It would be impossible here to expound fully the argument which handles the various difficulties that readily suggest themselves to such an interpretation, but which, while it steers clear of all Newtonian or nebular theories, geological formations, organic remains, development hypotheses, and laws of natural selection, makes it abundantly evident that a statement which should be conformed to the absolute truth of nature, or to any particular stage of subsequent scientific discovery, was not to be expected, and would not be likely to answer any useful purpose; while such a comprehensive classification as that given in the sacred record would be admirably designed to counteract idolatrous tendencies, and incontrovertibly to establish the prime truth on which all revealed religion turns. Such a classification of the universe can never be superseded, and will always be ready with its sublime lessons to the science of every successive age.

Again, with great ability, Mr. Quarry enumerates, in the description of *Paradise and the Fall*, various elements of an obviously allegorical character. He would not deprive the narrative of its historical truth; nor would he transform it into a myth, or an apologue; but he calls attention to the abundant evidence of the mystical or hieroglyphic dress in which an historical fact of infinite importance is robed. A hundred pages are subsequently devoted to the offspring of fallen man, and to

remarks on some of the subsequent narratives. Much valuable comment, careful exegesis, and skillful reply to modern skeptical treatment of the Book of Genesis, characterize this portion of the work. Without indorsing the conclusions of this dissertation, we strongly commend them to the consideration of biblical scholars.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.) Second Number, 1867.—1. Dr. G. KAPP, The Christianization of Bohemia. 2. KOHLER, Documents Relative to the History of Reformation in Hesse. 3. LINDER, Dr. Peter Megerly, a Contribution to the History of the Controversies between Lutherans and German Reformed in the Seventeenth Century. 4. PRESSEL, Elector Ludwig of the Palatinate and the Formula of Concord.

DORPATER ZEITSCHRIFT FUR THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE. (Dorpat Journal for Theology and Church.)—1. OETINGER, The Importance of Schopenhauer's Philosophy for Christian Apologetics. 2. VOLCK, The latest Results of Egyptology with Regard to the Holy Scriptures. 3. NERLING, The Biblical Meaning of προοριζειν and εκλεγειν. 4. Confession before the Lord's Supper. 5. OETINGER, The First "Protestantentag," (General Assembly of the Protestant Association.) 6. Proceedings of the Provincial Diets of Esthonia and Courland.

The Philosophy of Schopenhauer, to which we have repeatedly had occasion to call attention in former numbers of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, continues to engage the attention of the German scholars. To the numerous works on his philosophy and life which have appeared before, several have been added during the past few years, the most important of which are a monograph by R. Haym, (*Arthur Schopenhauer.* Berlin, 1864,) and an essay in a work on modern German Philosophy, by Dr. O. Liebman, (*Kant und die Epigonen.* Stuttgardt, 1865.) The great ability of Schopenhauer, from a merely literary point of view, is now generally acknowledged, and every one is surprised that his works were for thirty years so entirely ignored by the writers on and the teachers of philosophy. His case in this respect, it is said, can only be compared with that of Spinoza. At the same time the fundamental views of Schopenhauer, which approach nearer the nihilistic mythology of Buddhism than any other system of modern philosophy, are too paradoxical to find many followers who are willing to subscribe to all the tenets of their master. In the first article of the Dorpat journal, Professor Oetinger undertakes to examine the system of Schopenhauer from a Christian point of view. He fully acknowledges the high position of Schopenhauer as a thinker, and maintains that his works contain many gems which Christians can value; also many great truths and many half truths. On the other hand he shows which are the fundamental errors of the system, which, as a whole, is pointed to as another warning exam-

ple "whither man, without belief in the living, trinitarian God, must go astray—into the horrid abyss of nihilism."

The second article in this same theological journal is of great interest for students of the Old Testament. It states briefly and comprehensively the chief points of an article by the well-known Egyptologist, Heinrich Brugsch, entitled, "Moses and the Monuments," (in this work: *Aus dem Orient.* Berlin, 1864,) and undertaking to show the complete harmony between the Holy Scriptures and the trustworthy information which thus far has been obtained from the Egyptian monuments.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) Second Number, 1867. —1. SCHLOTTMAN, The Bridal Train of the Song of Songs. 2. JACOBSON, On the Meaning of Vocation and Justification. 3. ROMANG, Justification by Faith. 4. GALAD, Remarks on Gal. iii, 20. 5. HOLLENBERG, Correction of some Statements of Theodore of Mopsuestia.—Reviews of Frank's History of Protestant Theology, by Tholuck; of Reuter's History of Alexander III., by Vogel; of Keim's, The Christ of History, by Barman; of Roth's Gymnasial Pædegogics, by Hollenberg.

French Reviews.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*November* 1.—1. CH. DE REMUSAT, The Liberal Party and the European Movement. 3. AMPERE, Roman Life at the Time of Augustus. 4. LEON FEER, Burmah and the Burmans. 5. SAVENEY, Modern Physics, and Modern Ideas on the Unity of Natural Phenomena. 7. REYBAUD, The Political Economy of the Workingmen.

November 15.—2. The Naval Combat of Lissa and the Iron-clad Navy. 3. SAVENEY, Modern Physics, and Modern Ideas on the Unity of Natural Phenomena. 5. DU HAILLEY, The Chinese Abroad. 6. CARO, Metaphysics and Positive Science.

December 1.—ESQUIROS, England and English Life, (thirty-second article.) 2. COUNT D'HAUSSONVILLE, The Roman Court and the First Consul before the Coronation of the Emperor. 5. BLERZY, The English Colonies of Malasia. 7. MANADE, Italy and Rome before the Convention of September 15.

December 15.—1. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE, President Johnson and the American Congress. 2. E. DE LAVELEYE, A. Wierz, a Contemporaneous Belgian Painter. 3. S. R. TAILLANDIER, Studies on New Germany. 5. SAVENEY, Modern Physics, and Modern Ideas on the Unity of Natural Phenomena.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Genesis and its Authorship. Two Dissertations. I. On the Import of the Introductory Chapters of the Book of Genesis. II. On the Use of the Names of God in the Book of Genesis, and on the Unity of its Authorship. By JOHN QUARRY, A. M. 8vo. London and Edinburgh: Wm. Williams & Norgate. 1866.

The object of Mr. Quarry's learned and able work is not so much to reconcile Moses and science by any particular theory, as to re-

move, once for all, all issue between them. He would establish with new force the maxim that theology and science, being made each to cover their own legitimate ground, can have no collision. He professedly accomplishes his object by a somewhat thorough-going process. He first, adopting Mr. Rorison's theory of the Mosaic creation, (noticed by us in a former Quarterly,) denies all historical or scientific purpose in the first chapter of Genesis. Not content with this, he next proceeds to the second and third chapters, and while he denies their historical validity, he still firmly maintains their theological truth. Taken as literal history, he affirms that there is irreconcilable contradiction between the first and second chapters. And he therefore removes them both into the region of symbol or parabolic narrative. While fully embracing the doctrine of the fall, he entirely rejects the biblical narrative as a literal account of the facts of the fall. The fourth chapter, embracing the narrative of Cain, "which carries on the names Adam, Eve, and Eden, from the preceding chapters," is dimly semi-historical; and history proper commences with the genealogy in chapter fifth.

What is remarkable, our readers will find, by consulting our Synopsis of Quarterlies, that Mr. Quarry's book is not only uncondemned by the most orthodox Christian periodicals of England, such as the dissenters' "British Quarterly Review," and the Scottish Presbyterian organ, "The British and Foreign Evangelical Review," but commended by them to the favorable attention of the public. From this we infer that the late developments of science and of scientific theory, including the doctrines of Darwin, and the probable proofs of the high antiquity of the human race, derived from fossil and linguistic discoveries, are so broadly affecting the public mind as to call, with apparent imperativeness, for a fundamental reconsideration of the whole ground. Thus much, at least, is certain, that the literal historical character of the early chapters of Genesis can, in the interests of evangelic truth and in a reverent spirit, be thoroughly questioned and decisively rejected, without affecting the questioner's character for orthodoxy.

We indicated in a former Quarterly our decided though not irreversible approval of Mr. Rorison's exposition of the Mosaic creation. The analysis of the interior structure of the chapter itself, clearly demonstrates to our view that it is constructed on other than scientific principles. All the ingenious theories by which it has been forced to agree with science, are purely unscientific dreams. The six days are divisible into two sets of *three;* the former set presents the receptacles, and the latter set the occupants.

The number seven symbolizes (as we have shown in our Commentary on Luke x, 13) God's development of creation. Its sublime imagery and majestic rhythm entitled it to be styled the Psalm of Creation. And we heartily repeat a former thought of our own, not as a fact but as a favorite fancy, that it may have been composed by Adam, and chanted in the Church of the patriarchal ages.

We see not the slightest objection to the theory that Genesis is largely composed of pre-existing documents, arranged and adjusted by Moses, under divine direction. What is gained in point of authenticity or value by denying all previous record, and throwing Moses entirely on oral tradition, we cannot understand. It is absurd to suppose that a traditional narrative becomes less authentic by being transferred from the oral to the written. On the contrary, there is something gratifying in the thought that in the Pentateuch we read not only the writings of Moses, but those, perhaps, of Adam, of Seth, of Enoch, forming the growing Bible of the primitive Church of the early race. We can thence easily understand how these golden fragments, being few and far between, and covering vast ages, were very incomplete even in Moses's hands. The description of Paradise, with its four mystical rivers, we would here suggest, if the document be antediluvian, would suit no region now existing; so that the search for the rivers of Paradise, at the present day, is perhaps as wise as the hunt for the golden Eldorado.

The second and third chapters have such an interior completeness as to suggest the idea of being one single document. This view is confirmed by the fact that, whereas, in the first chapter the divine name is uniformly God, in these two chapters it is with equal uniformity, save in a single explicable case, Lord God, Jehovah-Elohim. The whole narrative, it must be confessed, possesses an eminently symbolic look. The whole scene seems ideal, and the transactions apparently belong to an air-hung region. Yet the scenes and events look not half so mythical as the ideal pictures of some geological long past era, the carboniferous age, for instance, with its splendors of vegetable glory, or its animals of fantastic shape and habits. We intimated in our last Quarterly that Gen. ii, 7, may be susceptible of an interpretation by which Darwin need not reject Moses. But if Mr. Quarry's Hebrew criticism is correct, 18–20 affirms that man was created before the animal races, contradictory to the first chapter; and by his view the building of Adam's rib into the person of Eve is forever a myth. And the whole chapter of the fall is not a narrative, but simply a symbolical picture of the degradation of the human race

below its moral ideal. This is purchasing immunity from collision with science at a very high price. Without impugning the orthodoxy of the man who, with a conservative purpose, offers the price, we imagine that the security can be obtained at a cheaper expense.

We have nowhere seen a thorough discussion of the real value of the Hebrew NAMES occurring in the first few chapters of Genesis. Most of these names had a significant import. They are, indeed, not so much names as appellatives. Some of these names or appellatives were given at birth; their import being intended by the parent, and founded on some parental idea or expectation. Eve named her first-born *Cain*, that is, *Gain*, because she had *gained* a man, a Jehovah. As if disgusted with her mistake, she calls her second, *Abel*, Vanity. And after her second was slain, she calls her third, *Seth*, Substitute. Such are the significant birth-names. But then there is another set of appellatives, not birth-names, but post-names, given, or taken, later in life, in allusion to some fact or quality. So most of the posterity of Cain are named. Jabal, the *itinerant*, is so called because he was the first of Nomads. Tubal-Cain is by signification a brass or iron-smith. Now, the primitive language was not Hebrew; and, as far as we can judge, we have simply the Hebrew translation of the original appellative. We know not the names of any of these primitive worthies. Each one comes to us masquerading under an *alias*.

But what is of special importance, most eminent among these substitutes for names, is the word *Adham*, *Adam*, or *Man*. This word can scarce in any case be considered a proper name. The first man of Genesis is called simply *Man*, or *the Man*. So Tacitus, singularly enough, tells us that the ancient Germans held that the first of mortals was called *Mannus*. It is well for the Hebrew scholar to note how variously this one word is rendered by our translators, in the first six chapters of Genesis, in accordance with their theory of interpretation. In Gen. i, 26, *Let us make Adham*, *man*, the word signifies race, or the archetypal man. In chapter ii, 7, *Adham* is doubtfully either the race or the individual. Through the succeeding verses our translators render *Adham* by *man*, until they get to verse 19, when it suddenly becomes *Adam*. And yet in verse 23, *Isha*, which is as much a proper name as *Adham*, is rendered *woman;* yet *woman* with a capital, as if woman were a proper name. At the very next verse, 24, *Adam* sinks again from a proper into a common noun, *man*. Thus alternately and somewhat arbitrarily the term is made to wear two imports. In chapter v, 1, 2, the word *Adham* is both singular and plural, both

male and female. In chapter vi, 1, *Adham* becomes plural, and signifies lineage: *When Adham began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them.* From all which it is clear that the name of the first man is to us wholly unknown, if name he had. No other name in the Bible passes through anything like such varied Protean shapes. Who knows, therefore, *if the Adham through the first five chapters of Genesis designates the same individual?* We know that the *Adham* of the sixth chapter is not individually the *Adham* of the second. Are we sure that the Adham of chapter ii, 7, is individually as well as lineally the same as the Adham of chapter third? Is it certain that the *Adham* of the fourth chapter is individually the *Adham* of the third? May not consecutive history commence at the fifth chapter, and the genealogy of that chapter be simply fastened to the lineal stock, by giving the lineal name, *Adham*, to its first progenitor? Or may not the name of this head of the genealogy have, from its eminence and significance, reverted back and been given to the whole anterior line? *Adham*, *man*, thereby becomes simply a lineage word, designating variously either the prehistoric Messianic line, (including the entire congenital race of which that line is the central nucleus,) or some individual in it, a continuous personality, like Pharaoh or Cæsar, connecting Christ (according to the chronology given by Luke) with the *Adham* who was the *Son of God.* We know that the genealogies given by the Evangelists leave large and no doubt systematic omissions. From the fact that both the leading genealogies in Genesis include precisely ten generations, we have reason to suspect that, like Matthew's genealogy, they are systematically trimmed down, and simply intended to serve as lineal guide-posts through the historic and prehistoric ages. "Who is to certify that the antediluvian and ante-Abrahamic genealogies have not been condensed in the same manner as the post-Abrahamic?"* Yet very probably of this first genealogy in the fifth chapter, *the main blank is at the beginning;* and the commencement after the blank is indicated by the typical name Adham. If this view should stand investigation, (and we do not say that it will,) all issue against scriptural chronology derived from ethnology, philology, fossil discovery, or "natural selection," is at an end.†

* See our notice of "Pentateuch Vindicated," by Professor Green, of Princeton, in a former Quarterly.

† And then, though the plurality of origins of the human race is unprovided for in the sacred text, yet even Agassiz, perhaps, with his polygenetic theory, need not reject Moses. He might hold the Adham of chapter ii, 7 to be the original

Similar phenomena characterize the naming of the woman. It seems to be a peculiarity of the primitive writer to narrate a process of *naming*, to identify an *object* to our notice. Thus, chapter i, 5, he identifies *darkness* as *night*, and *light* as *day*, by telling us that God so *called* them. And in chapter v, 3, "called their name Man," means they were truly man. And so when, chapter ii, 23, man *calls* his new consort, *Isha*, the sacred writer means to say that she truly *was* woman. And so after the fall, chapter iii, 20, in prospect of a future progeny, the writer makes Adam's naming her Eve, *Chavah*, Life, to merely identify woman as the maternal life of the race. So "Man embraced his consort Life," chapter iv, 1. This word *Chavah* may be merely the Hebrew translation of some unknown appellative, which may or may not have ever been a true proper name. And how far the births from so generic a parentage are individual and historical, may hereafter be matter for as fundamental reconsideration as the Mosaic cosmogony has elicited.

Assuming, against Mr. Quarry, the second and third chapters to be a literal history of the primordial Adham, chapter iv, 1–24, (in which the divine name becomes Jehovah exclusively,) seems to bring us to a later age, when a murderer fears a multitude of

progenitor of the Messianic line, the predecessor in origin, the federal head, and the type, in his fallen estate, of the progenitors of every other human race. The unity of the species would then be not of lineage but of nature; not congenital but transcendental. There would be "one blood" but not one ancestor. The Messianic line would be the priestly vicarious line for all, as Christ would be the priestly vicarious atonement for all. We pretend not to say how this view would meet the demand of various scripture texts. We throw out the thought, but offer not ourself for its defense. Our object is not to show believers in Moses how they may become Darwinians or polygenists, but to show Darwinians and polygenists how they may be believers in Moses.

One thought more is necessary to the completion of this view. The mere physicist may hold to both the Darwinian and the Agassizian theories. He may hold, that is, with Darwin, that humanity is developed from the lowest forms of sentient nature; and he may hold, with Agassiz, that it comes into independent existence in different localities and ages of the earth. Man is then both developed and polygenetic. Such a physicist, in order to see himself consistent with Moses and Paul, may hold that Gen. ii, 7, describes the instauration of Adam by the power of the divine breath in the image of God, in the type of the future Incarnate; he may hold that, as probationary federal head, the Edenic Adam was the type in which all developments into humanity would have been by the divine breath, through the favor of the future Incarnate, inaugurated, had Adham not fallen; and he may hold that the fallen federal head became the actual type for all, until a better Adam "restore us and regain the blissful seat." Surely a route to the cross of Christ should be opened from every clime and every form of prevalent human thought where possible.

avengers, (v. 14,) and when it would seem that cities are founded, (v. 17.) The anticipatory fragment, chapter iv, 24–26, coincides with chapter v, 3–6; and indicates (in the form of the two maternal utterances, verses 1 and 25,) that as Cain was born of the central Messianic Adhamic stock, yet diverged into an apostate line, and Abel was slain childless, so a better line of the stock, through Seth, became the true Messianic.

The second, third, and fourth chapters, then, we might consider, not myth, nor allegory, with Mr. Quarry, but literal fact, with unknown names; history, not indeed in close consecutive train, but in precious fragments—significant historic pictures, illustrative sketches in the Messianic lineage. Thus the Old Testament is the preparatory to Christ.

In chapter fifth we have a new and elohistic document; namely, the Messianic genealogy, beginning with the father of Seth, a personal Adam. So the writer, perhaps Noah, in the first sentence, declares; in the second sentence he pauses to recapitulate the divine origin of the lineal stock; and then, verse 3, he commences the pedigree, to terminate with the father of the race renewed. While in chapter sixth the Hebrew word for man or men, occurring nine times in the first seven verses, is, with a single exception, this same Adham. The English reader would perhaps best realize the case by reading the word Man through the entire six chapters.

And it may turn out a most important point, not hitherto noted, that while the first and third sentences of chapter five designate the individual Adam heading the genealogy, the intervening sentence, as we might construe it, describes the Adham as lineage or species; namely, as primitively created, as plural, and of both sexes. The first sentence is, strictly speaking, the *title* of the Genealogical Table, in the possession apparently of the family of Noah. The second sentence introduces the genealogy, by distinguishing between the personal Adam, whose appellative commences it, and the antecedent Adhamic lineage, of which he is the terminal link, and from which he emerges, as commencing link of a new historic chain. He is a link in both chains, being included as one with the continuous Adham in chapter iv, 25, as he is individual head of the historic pedigree here. The Adam of verse 3 is the personal Adam of verse 1, individually; he is identical with lineal Adam of verse 2, genetically. Verse 2 tells how the Adam of verse 3 came by his lineal appellation, and assures us that he is in the right Adamic line from the creation.

Finally, against construing the second and third chapters as literal individual history, Mr. Quarry urges the strong anthropo-

morphic coloring. The Lord God makes man, chapter ii, 7, as a potter would a vessel; he puts him into a garden, and then puts him to sleep into a wife-forming operation; he takes a walk in the garden at evening; he makes clothes for the naked pair. Does not all that point, we reply, to the great fact that the Jehovah-Elohim of this wonderful narrative was the divine Second Adam in personal form, tenderly cherishing the infant though full-formed first Adam? So Christ is the Jehovah of the Old Testament, and would have become incarnate, perhaps, had man never fallen.

Charles Wesley Seen in his Finer and Less Familiar Poems. 24mo., pp. 398. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1857.

The great Head of the Church seemed to mean a wonderful religious movement when he gave to Methodism such an organizer as John Wesley, such a preacher as Whitefield, and such a hymnist as Charles Wesley. That Methodism has not proved unworthy these illustrious names, is clear from the magnanimity with which she has held them aloft when the world flouted them with scorn, until, after the close of a century, they shine unquestioned stars in the firmament. We smiled, therefore, when Mr. Bird, in his able and eloquent articles on Charles Wesley, rebuked the Methodists for not having done justice to his fame by the publication of a complete edition of all his works. The performance of such a work would by no means necessarily increase his reputation. The choicest of his productions have doubtless been selected, and nothing would be gained to him or the world by a mass of inferiorities presented to the world because they were his. Yet our thanks are due Mr. Bird for his enthusiastic and effective labors. The articles to which we have referred, and the volume before us, are beautiful tributes to the genius of Wesley.

The pieces are classified into Autobiographic, Occasional, Doctrinal and Polemic, Scriptural and General. His poem on the Horrible Decree has no rare poetic merit, but expresses with great force a doctrine which the Calvinistic formulas and authorities abundantly express. A contemporary religious hebdomadal, the New York *Evangelist*, deprecates the publication of this piece as reviving the bitter personalities of "Toplady and Wesley." The unwise critic would have spoken more truly had he said of *Toplady against Wesley.* In that great controversy Wesley and Fletcher did expose the horrors of "the horrible decree," of predestination itself, as was right; but the ribaldries, the burlesques, the slanders, the invectives upon persons, came from the Calvinistic

side alone. Never were polemics more pure from personalities than those of Wesley and Fletcher, and that, too, in spite of the most scandalous provocations. The triumph of Christian truth was crowned with the still higher triumph of Christian temper.

There is one of Charles Wesley's hymns upon which Mr. Bird has passed a scathing condemnation, which Dr. Floy censured, and which has been rejected from the late editions of our hymn books, which we take this occasion firmly to defend and honor. The hymn,

"Ah lovely appearance of death,"

is rarely excelled for originality, solemnity, and pathos by the genius of Charles Wesley. It was in the earlier American collection; it was specially associated with one of the most simple and touching melodies with which our early Methodist music abounded; and to our own memory it is hallowed as often heard in our boyhood from sainted lips.

The objection to this hymn is that it most absurdly attempts to find a corpse an attractive object, and attempts to awaken feelings in which nobody can or should sympathize. We can recall but one instance of a poet besides Charles Wesley who finds poetic beauty in a corpse, and that is Lord Byron. The passage is one of the earlier paragraphs of his Giaour, in which he compares the present beauty of Greece to the beauty of a corpse. In his note to the passage he makes the following remark: "I trust that few of my readers have ever had an opportunity of witnessing what is here attempted in description; but those who have will probably retain a painful remembrance of that singular beauty which pervades, with a few exceptions, the features of the dead a few hours, and but for a few hours, after 'the spirit is not there.'"

He who hath bent him o'er the dead
Ere the first day of death is fled,
The first dark day of nothingness,
The last of danger and distress,
(Before Decay's effacing fingers
Have swept the line where beauty lingers,)
And marked the mild angelic air,
The rapture of repose that's there,
The fixed yet tender traits that streak
The languor of the placid cheek,
And—but for that sad shrouded eye,
That fires not, wins not, weeps not now,
And but for that chill, changeless brow,
Where cold obstruction's apathy
Appals the gazing mourner's heart,
As if to him it could impart
The doom he dreads, yet dwells upon;
Yes, but for these, and these alone,

Some moments, ay, one treacherous hour,
He still might doubt the tyrant's power;
So fair, so calm, so softly sealed,
The first, last look by death revealed!
Such is the aspect of this shore;
'Tis Greece, but living Greece no more!
So coldly sweet, so deadly fair,
We start, for soul is wanting there.
Hers is the loveliness in death,
That parts not quite with parting breath;
But beauty with that fearful bloom,
That hue which haunts it to the tomb,
Expression's last receding ray,
A gilded halo hovering round decay,
The farewell beam of feeling past away!
Spark of that flame, perchance of heavenly birth,
Which gleams, but warms no more its cherished earth!

Now that is one of the most beautiful passages of modern poetry, and all its effect is derived from the visible beauty of a dead body. It is, however, inferior to the hymn of Wesley, in that the beauty delineated is purely esthetical, whereas Wesley describes an inexpressible moral and divine beauty, connected with repose from the toils, sorrows, and sins of life, and the hush of the spirit to its eternal and ineffable repose. The corpse lying in marble beauty before him is the sweet and solemn symbol of the glorious emancipation of the sons of God. We quote from memory, for our critical editors, no thanks to them, have ejected the lines from the book.

"Ah lovely appearance of death!
What sight upon earth is so fair?
Not all the gay pageants that breathe
Can with a dead body compare.
With solemn delight I survey
The corpse when the spirit has fled,
In love with the beautiful clay,
And longing to lie in its stead.

"How blest is our brother bereft
Of all that could burden his mind;
How happy the soul that has left
This wearisome body behind.
Of evil incapable thou,
Whose relics with envy I see;
No longer in misery now,
No longer a sinner like me," etc.

If you deny that to be poetry of great pathos and power, you ought to have every feather plucked out of your wings, Mr. Bird.

Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Book of Genesis. By M. W. JACOBUS. 2 vols. 12mo., pp. 304, 256. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1865.

We have more than once noted how little has been done by the biblical scholars of our country in the field of exposition upon the Old Testament, and especially upon Genesis. Single books of the Old Testament, as Daniel, Job, Psalms, and Isaiah, have been ably

treated by different scholars. The New Testament has been overladen with commentaries. But since the labors of Bush, the Pentateuch has been without a commentator. Perhaps the fact that Genesis is a battle-ground between science and revelation has frightened our biblical heroes from the field. But the defenders of God's word should be men. Where the battle is hottest the rally should be thickest. But the contest has been hitherto waged not in the way of commentary, but of discussions, review articles, and other monograms.

We therefore welcome this effort by Professor Jacobus, a popular biblical exposition upon the first of the Mosaic books, published, we suppose, with the purpose of prosecuting an Old Testament commentary. The work is so well begun that we trust it will be completed. It is clear, scholarly, popular, evangelical, and conservative. It brings commentary down to the latest results. The author thinks it necessary now and then to fling in a streak of superfluous Calvinism, over which an appropriate black line might be drawn without damage to text or commentary. Otherwise it may be safely and unqualifiedly commended to students, families, and Bible-classes.

In his excellent introduction Professor Jacobus enumerates the different theories for interpreting the cosmogony of Moses, and then adopts the theory of a reconstruction of creation during the great week, after a period of chaos. This is matter of opinion. But at step after step there is to our eye a sad mal-adjustment. The theory is not suited to the text, and no forced interpretations can marry what God hath not joined. We have more than once intimated the individual opinion, that the Mosaic cosmogony is unhistorical, rhythmical, symbolical. Our view Professor Jacobus mentions to pronounce it summarily "a shift" for the "avoidance of difficulties," and says that his own is the theory of Augustine. To speak truly, Professor Jacobus must precisely exchange these statements. His theory is truly a shift first invented by Dr. Chalmers, about fifty years ago, and expanded by later inventors, for the professed purpose of avoiding the difficulties just then appearing from geology. On the contrary, it was the theory of Augustine, as Mr. Quarry shows, that the entire cosmos was created in all its details in a moment, and that the six days of Moses are simply the unfoldings to our view of those details in six various departments of nature. The days were subjective rather than objective, being so many modes or phases of mental view. The six days, according to Augustine, were six repetitions of the one day. And in this view he coincided with Basil, Origen, Jerome,

and Gregory Nazianzen. It was the doctrine of many of the doctors of the old Jewish Church. And their opinions were no shift for the avoidance of difficulties, but were formed before geology existed, and independently of any collision with physical science. Our traditional and scientific constructions of this chapter are Japhetic interpretations of a Shemitic text.

We cannot coincide with Professor Jacobus in the assumption quoted from Keil, in his preface, that there are any laws of exegesis which require a disregard of the facts of science. Surrounding science certainly forms one of the data, and an important one too, for attaining a true exegesis. Every court allows related physical facts to influence the interpretation of a legal document, as, for instance, of a will. If the facts are *thus*, the document means *this;* if the facts are *so*, the document means *that.* And if Professor Jacobus would but note it, his own interpretation is not the old ante-geological interpretation of Dr. Thomas Scott, but an innovation actually consequent upon modern science, and framed, however unsuccessfully, to meet it. And surely in a document like the earlier parts of Genesis, covering with a slender historical outline the area of ages, it may well be supposed that adjacent facts should aid to guide us to a true understanding of the words. Yet we fully coincide with Mr. Quarry that it is of great importance, as well as a just principle, that science and the Scripture text should stand without the pale of issue. How can we suppose that it was God's purpose to teach us, through Moses, the internal structure of the earth? It is the business of revelation to aid the regeneration of our souls; science is simply the results of the investigations of nature. It is a painful thing, and a dangerous thing, that those interpretations upon which we stake the veracity of Scripture are constantly trembling under the shock of some fresh announcement from the fields of geology, from the records of ethnology, from the deductions of physiological research. Scripture veracity is thus the sport of newspaper paragraphs; and interpreters are chasing after every fresh phase of science to match it with some fresh theory of interpretation. Several of Mr. Jacobus's interpretations are propped by certain one-sided scientific opinions, and others, touching both the creation and the deluge, are based upon results which next year may falsify.

The Life of Jesus. According to his Original Biographers. With Notes. By Edmund Kirke. 12mo., pp. 297. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1867.

Mr. Kirke in this little volume brings his rare powers to the task of presenting, in the words of the Evangelists blended into a

single text in the form of a monotessaron, the true Jesus, divested of that inreality to the mind produced by the plurality of authors, by antiquated translations, and by the arbitrary laceration into chapters and verses. We have before the mind's eye almost a new Jesus; yet, in truth, the former brought out into clearer light and more palpable reality. Mr. Kirke had performed the work for his own private use, for the attainment of the true idea, and he tells us in a style of unaffected modesty that it was the advice of a friendly clergyman which drew it into publication. It is accompanied with a few excellent notes, not specifically practical, but elucidatory, from sacred geography, history, or criticism, derived from a course of illustrative reading. It needed a map or two, and then we could very heartily recommend it to every man who wishes to study Jesus, not in Rénan, Ecce Homo, Neander, or Milman, but in his original eye-witnesses.

On page sixty-one Mr. Kirke gives us what is esteemed the latest and most satisfactory definition of a *miracle.* It is "the action of a higher law upon a lower one, by which the lower is for the time neutralized and suspended. Thus, whenever we lift a hand, we overcome the law of gravity, that is, our will suspends for the time the natural action of matter." Now we simply avail ourselves of this statement of the explanation of miracle, to take issue with it, and furnish what to our own mind is the true one. Mr. Kirke's statement overlooks the difference between a *law of nature* and *a process* under a law; the former is never suspended or neutralized; the latter is often suspended, or rather interrupted and modified.

Suppose a feather descends by gravitation until it alights upon the surface of a tin roof. A process is interrupted, namely, of the feather's descent to the earth under the law of gravitation; but the law itself continues in full force, confining the feather upon the roof. The law of gravitation does not require that the feather shall go to the earth through the impenetrable roof. The law is completely fulfilled by the feather's lying on its surface. Every law of nature in the existing conditions is fulfilled, and none interrupted, suspended, nullified, or overcome. Then suppose a wind blows the feather horizontally from the roof, and it falls to the ground. A process under law, namely, of the feather's repose upon the roof, is interrupted; but still no law is suspended. The interruption is produced by the incoming of a new antecedent, the horizontal force of the wind. Two processes, then, namely, of gravitation and horizontal force, take place under two different laws, modify each other, and result in an intermediate course of

things in the movements of the feather, but no law is suspended or neutralized. The feather is under the complete operation of all the law, both of gravitation and lateral force, belonging to the conditions of the case. A process is modified, interrupted, deflected, but no law suspended.

If a little stream of water is flowing down an inclined surface, and Mr. Kirke, interposing his hand, deflects the stream into a new direction, a process is interrupted, but no law is suspended. So if Christ, by a word of power, changed the direction of the wind, and arrested the storm, a process, a certain procedure of the wind, was interrupted and modified, but no law was suspended. If he changed the current of the human blood, and so arrested a disease, a process was modified, but no law suspended. The interposition of Christ's power was simply the introduction of a new antecedent or cause by which the process was interrupted and changed. That new antecedent acted under laws. For there are laws of the divine nature as well as of finite nature; laws of mind as well as laws of matter; laws of will as well as laws of intellect. When Mr. Kirke lifts his hand he does not "overcome a law of gravity," he simply interrupts and changes a process under that law, namely, of inert repose of his hand. His soul acted in accordance with law in willing the *lift* of the hand. And so in the whole process, law was always fulfilled, and never suspended. What, then, is a miracle?

A miracle is the interruption of a process under natural law by the interposition of some higher power; meaning by higher power, a power above the forces known by experience to form the system of our mundane nature.

Jesus, by his miracles, suspended no law. He only interrupted and modified processes by interpolating, from above, a new antecedent, changing the course which we experientially know that things would have taken without his interference.

Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity, and on the Attacks which are now being made upon it. By M. Guizot. 12mo., pp. 367. London: John Murray. 1866.

The appearance of a publication by Guizot is a noticeable event in the progress of European thought, more especially when it is one of a series put forth upon one of the highest topics of human reflection. It will be remembered that he has projected a serial work in four successive volumes. He was to furnish, first, meditations upon the subject-matter of Christianity; secondly, a history of the various phases through which Christianity has passed;

third, the present state and prospects of Christianity; and fourth, the future destiny of our holy religion, and the means and methods by which it is to attain a moral control over the human race. For reasons satisfactory to himself our author has changed the order of these publications, and has made the third the second; so that the present volume is a review of the actual state of Christianity, and its struggle with opposing powers.

To many readers it will appear a defect that the area of his review is limited almost exclusively to France alone. And as France with him is the world, and Paris is France, so in reviewing Paris he esteems himself as reviewing the Christianity of Christendom. This, on the whole, may be no disadvantage to the American reader. With us, from community of language, England is too much the entire world. It may be well to acquaint ourselves, through the light afforded by Guizot, with the world of thought and intellectual progress as represented by the French mind.

Of the present volume more than one half is entitled, "The Awakening of Christianity in France," and traces the history of French religious thought from the establishment of Christianity in France after the Revolution down to the present hour. The principal characters in succession are Napoleon, Chateaubriand, De Bonald, De Maistre, Abbé de la Mennais, and Lacordaire, among the Catholics. The Protestant history he traces through Haldane, Mark Wilks, Gaussen, Malan, Merle D'Aubigné, Vinet, and the Monods. The revivers of evangelical Christianity are made to pass generally under the name of Methodists, honoring and honored by the name.

> Their zeal was employed in a very circumscribed sphere; beyond it their names were unknown, and unknown they have remained. What spectators, what readers, what public knew at that time, or know even at this moment, what manner of men they were, or what their deeds—those men who called themselves Neff, Bost, Pyt, Gonthier, Audebez, Cook, Wilks, Haldane? But who, I would ask, in the time of Tacitus and of Pliny, knew what manner of men they were, and what the deeds of Peter, Paul, John, Matthew, Philip—the unknown disciples of the Master, unknown himself, who had overcome the world? Notoriety is not essential to influence; and in the sphere of the soul, as in the order of nature, fountains are not the less abundant because their springs are hidden in obscurity. The Christian missionaries of our time did not trouble themselves to lessen that obscurity. To literary celebrity they had no pretension, nor did they seek the triumph of any political idea, of any specific system of organization, of any favorite plan in which their personal vanity was interested; the salvation of human souls was their only passion and their only object.

Having thus traced the condition of Christianity in the first half of the volume, Guizot brings under review the opposing forces. These are Spiritualism, Rationalism, Positivism, Pantheism, Materialism, Skepticism, and finally Impiety, Recklessness, and Perplexity

as the results. To each of these he assigns its fatal defect and injury. These chapters abound with beautiful remarks, expressed in most transparent style, both in Guizot's own words and in quotations from the master minds of France. Perhaps there is a sense of incompleteness arising from the necessary brevity of treating so rapidly so many stupendous topics. Still to us the book is replete with the most unflagging interest.

The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Translated by Dr. ROBERTS, Dr. DONALDSON, and F. CROMBIE. 8vo., pp. 506. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1867. [On sale by Scribner, Welford, & Co., New York.]
The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras. Translated by Rev. MARCUS DODDS, A.M., Rev. GEORGE REITH, A.M., and Rev. B. P. PRATTEN. 8vo., pp. 465. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1867. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Co.

We have received from Mr. Scribner a prospectus of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, announcing the publication, by the Clarks of Edinburgh, of the entire works of the Christian writers previous to the Council of Nice. When we reflect upon the character and position of these writings, we are not only gratified at the announcement of this enterprise, but are amazed that it has never before been undertaken. To the Church at large, no literature since the canon was closed is so important. Whatever defects may characterize these productions, they are the basis of the historical evidences of Christianity. Nor can any fair mind study their pages without feeling that besides the proofs of the authenticity of the New Testament documents, here furnished, we have complete demonstration that the substance of true evangelical Christianity, as contained in the New Testament, took existence and start from the age of Christ. If Matthew's Gospel be but a bundle of traditions, or John's Gospel but a manifesto from the elders of Ephesus, still the religion of the New Testament is a great tangible fact; it is contained in substance and spirit in this ante-Nicene library, and took its rise at the assigned age and from the person Christ. We are to make allowance in reading for the rudeness of their age. We are not to look for infallibility. We must expect in each one, perhaps, some specialty of error, some individualism of doctrine. Eliminate these, and we have in these Christian remains sources of knowledge, interest, and edification, perfectly unique in character, pre-eminent "aids to faith," and guides to catholic doctrine.

Complaints have often been made of the defectiveness of the translations issued by the Clarks, but the high character of the present translators is pledge for the excellence of their work. The

work of Dr. Roberts on the Gospels, and of Dr. Donaldson on patristic literature, have attained a high mark in the estimation of Christian scholars.

The two volumes before us embrace the very earliest remains of the post-apostolic Church. They follow next upon the closed canon. The next volume will include the works of Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, Hermias, and the rest of the Apologists. The entire Library will amount to SEVENTEEN VOLUMES. It will of course include the writings of the more brilliant age of Christian literature, of Irenæus, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Lactantius.

Scribner, Welford, & Co., we will say for the information of those who wish to obtain these publications, have made arrangement for furnishing them to American purchasers at the price of four volumes for fourteen dollars. The person desiring to so purchase should send his name as subscriber to this firm, directing how the volumes shall be sent, by mail or otherwise.

The Book of Proverbs, in an Amended Version. With an Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By JOSEPH MUENSCHER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 265. Gambier, Ohio: Western Episcopalian Office. 1866.

Biblical critics are beginning to give greater attention than formerly in this country to the elucidation of the Old Testament. Hitherto the greater amount of such labors has, perhaps very properly, been expended on the New Testament. But the time has come for a more thorough exposition and critical review of the older portions of the sacred record. America must not leave this rich and important field of research wholly to foreign laborers. She has demands and needs of her own, which can only be fully met by the provident care and toil of her own sons. Her ministry and intelligent laity, her seminaries of learning, Sunday-schools, and Bible-classes have their peculiar wants, not so well understood nor cared for by foreigners, and which native expositors alone can well supply. We therefore hail every respectable attempt in this direction with pleasure and a hearty welcome. The work of Dr. Muenscher on the Book of Proverbs is a valuable contribution to the biblical literature of our country. The Introduction, of about fifty pages, gives, first, a well-written sketch of the life and character of Solomon; and, secondly, an essay on his writings. In this is discussed briefly the canonicity of the books ascribed to Solomon, and some peculiarities of their contents and style. The subject of proverbial writing in general receives attention, and the proverbs of Solomon in particular. Here we have also, what is

very useful to the ordinary reader, some illustrations of the characteristics of Hebrew poetry.

The amended version of the text departs slightly from the common English version; it being the translator's aim, as he avows, to deviate from it no farther than perspicuity and fidelity to the original seemed to require. The version is thrown into parallel lines corresponding to the original. The translation is a good one; and a good translation is frequently the best exposition. The notes exhibit care, skill, sober judgment, extensive reading and consultation of authorities—versions, lexicons, and previous annotators. They are sufficiently full for the object of the work, and the style is plain and perspicuous. In his foot-notes he frequently gives us the benefit of the researches of previous translators and critics. The mechanical execution of the work is not in the best style of the art, and it is somewhat marred by errors in the Hebrew quotations—a thing, however, difficult to avoid, except by the abundant care of the most experienced compositors and proof-readers. H.

Sermons by the late Alexander M'Clelland, D.D. Edited by RICHARD W. DICKINSON, D.D. 12mo., pp. 424. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Dr. M'Clelland was ordained as pastor, in 1815, of the Rutgers-street Presbyterian Church, New York, which he served with great ability seven years, when he was elected Professor of Rhetoric, Logic, and Metaphysics in Dickinson College. In 1829 he was elected Professor at New Brunswick, N. J., where he remained until his death, in 1864. In his day his originality and piquancy, bordering on eccentricity, acquired a brilliant popularity. His great powers justified the early expectation of his friends, that he would produce monumental proofs of their greatness, which should long survive him, which he never fulfilled. In his zenith the announcement that he was to preach always secured an overflowing house. But he grew reluctant to allow the annunciation of his name, declined to give his public performances to the press, and, with the exception of a few publications not much above the dignity of pamphlets, this volume seems to be his only public memento.

From both the well written memoir by Mr. Dickinson, and the sermons themselves, we seem to get a clear idea of the man. It was wayward in him to draw so dense a lantern shade around the blaze of his genius. We have heard, on good authority, that he used to say that, had he to begin life over again, he would prefer to be a Methodist preacher; and we decidedly believe that we

should have turned a much larger "net result" out of him. His sermons, without being eccentric or meretricious, are unique, fresh, buoyant, pointed, biblical, evangelical. He knew how to avoid the routine track without deserting the legitimate field of pulpit truth. Few volumes of sermon literature have been published at this day more attractive to the reader, and remunerative in the perusal. There should have been more where these came from.

The Parable of the Prodigal Son. With Notes by JAMES HAMILTON D.D., F.L.S.; and Illustrations by HENRY COURTENAY SELOUS. 12mo., pp. 196. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Dr. Hamilton comes forth in the above work in all the fullness of his great powers of thought and language. The volume presents a richly "pictured page," both from the eloquence of the writer and the hand of the artist. The only drawback seems to be, that Dr. Hamilton's style is so high-wrought that it is liable to be read rather for its eloquence than for its practical value. The sinner loses his sense of sin in pleasure at the vividness of its description.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Stars and the Angels. 12mo., pp. 357. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien. 1866. [On sale by N. Tibbals, Nassau-street, New York.]

Under this somewhat enigmatical title we have an ingenious essay at bridging over the distance between religion and modern science, designed to aid us in thinking the conceptions of both in harmony. Under the title *Stars* are discussed the nature of surrounding worlds, their possible inhabitants, the compatibility of their existence with the incarnation and atonement, and the reconciliation between geology and Moses. His theory of Mosaic interpretation is essentially the theory of Prof. Guyot, assuming the nebular hypothesis and a firmamental separation, by which the earth is individualized and wrought into final form.

Under the title *Angels*, forming the second part of the work, we have a discussion of the personal nature of the subjects of the divine government, angelic, demoniac, human. Man, the image of God, the form of the incarnate, he supposes to be the type of both angelic and demoniac personalities. Angels have spiritual bodies in human form, like the human form in its glorified state. Satan and the demons once had bodies; but sinning and falling like Adam, like Adam they died, and hence, as disembodied

spirits, have an earnest appetite to "possess" a body, even of a swine, if no other were eligible. In proof that angels have bodies, he quotes the various angelic appearances, where almost uniformly the angels are called *men*, and being wingless are sometimes mistaken for men.

Man is triune in nature, being body, soul, and spirit. Soul has its residence in the ganglionic nervous system, by which the unconscious or non-voluntary functions are performed, as, digestion, circulation, heart-beating, and organic assimilation. Spirit resides in the cerebro-spinal system, by which sensation, volition, and thought are transacted. Demoniac possession and Mesmerism he explains by supposing that one living agent obtains command of the nervous spirit of another. Spirit, he supposes, in its highest nature, to be "force," using the word in accordance with the latest scientific developments in regard to the indestructibility and transmutability of *force*. At death he maintains that all saints become, not disembodied spirits, but really are united to the glorious body of Jesus. The resurrection is not the reorganization, particle for particle, of the body that died; but an investment with a body that shall be. These points are illustrated with much skill, in an entertaining style, and a good degree of erudition. It is well worthy of perusal for a large number of incidental suggestions, even by those who may not embrace all his conclusions. We note a few points.

1. He makes the true distinction between the devil and the demons, the former never in the original being plural, but meaning the satanic chief, or possibly, in some cases, the infernal genus. But his theory that the devil and the demons have died, and never appear in personal form, is hardly compatible with the book of Job, or with the history of our Saviour's temptation. 2. If, as the best theologians agree, the Angel-Jehovah, so often apparent in the Old Testament, be Christ-Jehovah, his apparent body must have been an investiture assumed for the occasion. If so, so may that of all the other appearing angels, and the proof that they are permanently embodied beings is lost. 3. A resurrection which is not a reorganization of the body that dies, identical in substance, is not a resurrection, but a new creation. 4. A distinction between the soul and spirit is, we believe, legitimate, but not by our author correctly made. Soul is not confined solely to the non-voluntary, spontaneous functions of the corporeal system. It includes, we would rather say, all that belong to a mere *animal*, namely, appetites, sensations, perceptions. Spirit is the transcendental overlay; the *intuition* by which the absolute, the universal, the neces-

sary, the ethical, the beautiful, the holy, are thought. These are the upper chambers of our nature. While brutes have germs of consciousness, combination, and ratiocination, of these higher thoughts no lower species has the slightest element of capability. These, overlying and overspreading our nature, invest our being with a dignity out of all comparison with the inferior orders of intelligence.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Open Polar Sea. A Narrative of a Voyage of Discovery toward the North Pole in the Schooner "United States." By Dr. J. J. Hayes. 8vo., pp. 454. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

Dr. Hayes was acting surgeon in the expedition commanded by Dr. Kane, and has manifested an ambition and enterprise worthy his pupilage under so great a master. After having formed his purpose of prosecuting the enterprise of northern exploration, his first necessity was to remove from the public mind the discouragements arising from the results hitherto attained. By writings, by lectures, and by personal appeals, he at length obtained, by the liberality of an association of wealthy gentlemen, a compact and solid schooner, with all necessary supplies; and having selected a corps of hardy companions, he left Boston harbor in July, 1860. He bent his course for Davis's Straits, and, touching on the coast of Greenland, took in a supply of dogs, and reinforced his troop with a few hardy Greenlanders. Thence he steered through Baffin's Bay till it narrowed into Smith's Sound, where he was arrested by misfortunes and disasters, and obliged to enjoy the luxuries of an Arctic winter. The point where he wintered on the northwest shore of Greenland he named Port Foulke. In the spring he skirted along the north coast of Greenland, on the shore of Smith's Sound, and at length, crossing the sound, set foot upon Grinnell's Land, the northernmost coast hitherto known. Grinnell's Land lies in the fork where Smith's Sound branches into Hayes's Sound and Kennedy's Channel. Dr. Hayes pressed his onward way amid disasters and defeats, the exhaustion of his dogs, and the deaths of his men, until he at last retained but a single available comrade. These two men, Hayes and Knorr, continued their route until at last they stood upon the northeast shore of Grinnell's Land, and, with the rapture of Moses prospecting the promised land from the top of Pisgah, took one earnest view of the open Polar Sea. There they suspended the stars and stripes, hung by a whiplash fastened to two cliffs, and left a record secured in a small glass vial, which was brought for the purpose, announcing the fact of

their discovery to all future comers who shall have the curiosity to visit the spot. Dr. Hayes exulted in the fact of having projected discovery beyond the track of any human predecessor, and rejoiced in the assurance that he grasped the "great and notable thing" which had inspired the "zeal of sturdy Frobisher," and had achieved the "hope of matchless Parry."

But a transient glance upon the Polar Sea was all that was possible. He retraced his steps to Port Foulke, at which point he believes it is the true policy, in any future enterprise of discovery, to plant a small provisional colony. Then he is fully convinced that a summer voyage can easily be taken through an open and unobstructed channel to the broad Polar Sea, and without doubt to the very North Pole itself.

Dr. Hayes retraced his course to his native shore, and landed in Boston, and walking up State-street the first newspaper he obtained, bringing the news of the battle of Ball's Bluff, revealed to him the appalling fact that his country was involved in all the horrors of the most terrible of civil wars. He forthwith offered himself to the President for the service of his country in the hour of her trying need. He has availed himself of the return of peace to prepare his record for the public eye. The scientific results are to be published under the patronage of the Smithsonian Institute, and the present volume is his personal narrative for the popular eye.

Dr. Hayes writes in a fresh, flowing, natural, buoyant style. He is one of the most cheery and inspiriting of traveling companions. He is endowed with warm affections for his associates and subordinates, and takes a tender interest in their fate. He has the enthusiasm of a true genius for science and discovery, and seems to have exhibited all the tact of a skillful commander. We earnestly trust that the publication of his volumes will awaken fresh interest in the subject of northern exploration, and that a new equipment may enable him, furnished with all the results of his past experience, to hang the American flag on the summit of the North Pole.

The open Polar Sea is truly a nearly circular ocean, nearly two thousand miles in diameter, with a vast ice girdle for its circumference. Until lately it was generally supposed that the further from the tropics the more absolute was the reign of frost, and that consequently the arctic circle was crowned with a stupendous scab of intensest ice-rock. Against this result the Author of nature has provided a preventive in the Gulf Stream, which brings the warm waters of the tropics into the northern circle. The temperature of the Artic Sea allows no freezing but on the surface, and even then the icing of the surface is prevented by the agitation of the

arctic breezes. But in the sheltered spots, and on the shores, the ice maintains its hold, and the frozen girdle perpetually hems the sea.

The volume is done up by Hurd and Houghton in the splendid style of the Riverside press. It is illustrated by three beautiful maps, and a large number of fine engravings.

History of the Christian Church. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. Vols. 2 and 3. 8vo., pp. 1037. New York: Charles Scribner. 1867.

The present two volumes extend from Constantine to Gregory the Great. They include one of the most important periods of the history of the Church. We pass in review the Trinitarian, the Origenistic, the Christological, and Anthropological controversies, in which the mind of the Church analyzed with a profound sagacity the explicit import of her own doctrines, and bequeathed either established conclusions, or luminous discussions to aid us in deducing our own conclusions. Our readers know, from many articles appearing in our pages, how clear, ultimate, and profound is Dr. Schaff's treatment of the topics ecclesiastical history presents. Doctrinally, it is rarely that our Methodist theologians will find occasion to differ from him. The biographical portraitures of the eminent lights of these Christian ages are done with a master's pencil. The true life of the Church is made to animate her history. We may confidently trust that Dr. Schaff is presenting to the American Church a complete ecclesiastical history superior, on the whole, to any in the language. We deal in brief generalities, because we expect a full review, from an amply competent hand, for the pages of our Quarterly.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

Speeches and Addresses Delivered in the Congress of the United States, and on several Public Occasions. By HENRY WINTER DAVIS, of Maryland. Preceded by a Sketch of his Life, Public Services, and Character, being an Oration by Hon. J. A. J. CRESSWELL, United States Senator from Maryland. 8vo., pp. 596. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Senator Creswell has performed a noble duty in erecting this monument to the genius, patriotism, and manly integrity of Henry Winter Davis, Maryland's noblest son. This noble man was a son of an Episcopal clergyman, a graduate first of Kenyon College, and afterward of the University of Virginia. "My mother," says he, "was a lady of graceful and simple manners, fair complexion, blue eyes, and auburn hair, with a rich, exquisite voice, that thrills my memory with the echo of its vanished music. She was highly educated for her day, when Annapolis was the focus of intellect

and fashion for Maryland, and its fruits shone through her conversation, and colored and completed her natural eloquence, which my father used to say would have made her an orator if it had not been flung away upon a woman. She was the incarnation of all that was Christian in life and hope, in charity and thought, ready for every good work, herself the example of all she taught."

The earliest moral intuitions of Mr. Davis, condemning the surrounding institution of slavery with deep earnestness, were prophetic of his future career, and, underlying his great talents, were the basis of his true greatness. He came to the great questions of the day with something more than a politician's eye, and hence he was far-seeing and prescient, leading the timid party of freedom with the bold and manly tread of absolute principle. Hence he rebuked with just and scathing syllables the inefficiency of Mr. Lincoln's administration, and with the great body of most highly-toned advocates of freedom and justice, would have preferred something better than his re-election. The closing pages of the present volume demonstrate that Mr. Davis, before his decease, firmly stood at the point at which the party of freedom and nationality have at last nearly attained—the absolute necessity of suffrage for all for the safety of all.

Long will the Maryland of the future revere the memory of her Henry Winter Davis. Prolific as her bosom has been of copperheads, traitors, and assassins, who have crimsoned her capital with the blood of her nation's defenders, and sought to bathe it with the blood of her nation's president, pregnant as she has proved with Taneys, Marshal Kanes, and Swanns, she will still proudly claim that she redeems herself with her Davis and her Creswell, to be succeeded, we trust, by a long line of noble followers, champions for their country, and advocates of human right.

Belles-Lettres, Classical, and Philological.

Studies in English; or, Glimpses of the Inner Life of our Language. By M. Shele De Vere, LL.D., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Virginia. 12mo., pp. 360. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

It was one of the tokens of the practical modernized genius of Thomas Jefferson, that in founding the University of Virginia he placed the Anglo-Saxon and English language in its curriculum. It was a proof of wise discrimination in the curators to place Professor De Vere in that chair. The present volume is the result of a ripe scholarship, and will produce its effect in redeeming the im-

portant branch it teaches from its present great yet diminishing neglect. Our want of space prevents our more than recommending it to the attention of scholarly men.

Periodicals.

The Charleston Advocate. A. Webster, Editor; B. F. Randolph, T. W. Lewis, Assistant Editors.

We hail the advent of another star of freedom in the southern firmament. There is nothing so assures the triumph of truth and righteousness as the multiplication of unshackled organs of thought. Slavery could never have lived but by the suppression of free utterance. The human auction block and the free press could not stand side by side. For a while the block conquered the machine. But it was a suicidal conquest with a terrible reverse. There is an eloquent passage in one of John Philpott Curran's speeches, vividly depicting the value of a free press, for even the most despotic ruler, as a bold utterer of truths he would never otherwise hear, which are nevertheless essential to the safety of his throne. Flattery surrounds him with an atmosphere of pleasing but fatal falsehood, bewildered by which he leaps the precipice of ruin. So the late slaveholdership formed a system of fatal fallacies which it allowed no free press or free speech to contradict. First, slavery was a subject that must not be touched; next, it was a blessing that must be extended; next, the right of a state to secede was absolute; next, one southerner could whip ten northerners; and all these fallacies became axioms, because no one was allowed to contradict them. Their terrible explosion has passed, and on the ground they once occupied a free press is taking its victorious stand. With that free press, aided by the free school and the free Church, freedom and righteousness are sure of a perfect prevalence. And so we hail the omen of a Christian Advocate in the city of Charleston. The turbulent hotbed of proslaveryism, nullification, and secession—the scene where the Calhouns, the Rhetts, and the Keitts raved and rioted—is now receiving due lessons in loyalty, liberty, and peace. Terrible is the governmental force by which this result has been secured; but where the insurgent powers of evil are fierce and rampant, beneficent is even the temporary despotism that brings them to order.

The reconstruction measures finally adopted by Congress, though not precisely what we should have chosen, will be approved by the loyal North that carried the nation through the war in triumph. Its two main points are, 1. The enfranchisement of

the colored South; and, 2. The disfranchisement of about three per cent. of the insurgents against the national government.

In the first we exult, as the consummation of our thirty years' war against human bondage. We entertain no sympathy with the grief of the white southerner in feeling himself terribly wronged because men are endowed with their rights, and raised to the possession of their manhood. We laugh at the oppressor who screeches out *oppression!* because his victim is rescued from his fetter and his whip. And the world laughs with us. The southerner who howls because the bondsman is wrenched from his clench, is the laughing-stock of Christendom. Wherever there are hearts that beat high for freedom, wherever there are people aspiring to the franchises of manhood, there prayers and sympathies have been earnest for the victories of our Republic, and their sanction has been hearty for making that victory, by any exertion of power, the victory of suffering manhood. Our triumph has been a universal argument for man's capacity for freedom. It has awakened the masses of England to strike boldly for their rights, and their battle song is not "Maryland, my Maryland," but "John Brown," and the Marsellaise hymn.

As for the second point, we should have preferred universal amnesty. And nothing but a sense of unsafety prevented its adoption. The bloody riot at Memphis, the New Orleans massacre, the frequent announcement by southern politicians and churchmen that the freedmen were destined to extermination, the unanimous reports of our military commanders that the spirit of blood and insurrection was rife in the old dominant class, have all conspired to confirm the purpose of the loyal nation to carry its measures through with a firm, decisive hand. When the dangerous crisis is past, when the new order of things is firmly settled, and the normal current has resumed its tranquil flow, the military will be withdrawn, and the disfranchised class will doubtless gradually recover its ancient endowment. That military arrangement is properly a war measure, for whatever Andrew Johnson may have done, the northern people had never as yet fixed any adjustment of the terms of peace. And such had been the President's mismanagement, that the people have been at last obliged to secure the adjustment they required by military force.

The beneficial fruit of this severe but decisive action, we trust, will be the earlier restoration of peace and business operations. The earlier southern trade will resume her channels, agriculture will furnish her fruits, and manufactures will start their wheels. Time, reform, and the lessons of the past, will restore a better than the old Union.

Pamphlets.

The Philosophy of Methodism. A Centenary Discourse delivered before the Genesee Annual Conference, in Lockport, N. Y., October 5, 1866. By J. B. WENTWORTH, D.D. Published by order of the Conference. 16mo., pp. 90. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866.

A fresh and original train of thought in vigorous style.

The Immortality of Character. A Sermon. By Rev. J. EMORY ROUND. Brooklyn. 1867.

The Ideas and Feelings Necessary to National Greatness. A Sermon delivered before the Executive and Legislative Departments of the Government of Massachusetts, at the Annual Election, Wednesday, January 2, 1867. By HENRY WHITE WARREN. Boston: Wright & Porter. 1867.

Dr. Warren gives to his honorable audience fundamental truths in his own clear and trenchant phrase.

Miscellaneous.

The Market Assistant: containing a Brief Description of every Article of Human Food sold in the Public Markets of the Cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Brooklyn, including the various Domestic and Wild Animals, Poultry, Game, Fish, Vegetables, Fruits, etc., with many curious Incidents and Anecdotes. By THOMAS F. DE VOE, Author of "The Market Book," etc. 12mo., pp. 465. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

If any critic should imagine that the present volume possesses scarcely sufficient dignity of subject for our grave Quarterly to notice, he shows evidence of not being posted up in the most modern philosophy. The latest announcements from our savans seems to be that brain is all there is of mind, and that the old duplication of man into mind and matter is obsolete. Brains, then, being the only mind there is, and brains being organized victual, it is plain that your intellect is purchased at the market, carved at the table, and swallowed through your gullet. The volume deals therefore with pure, solid intellect. But with shame we confess our inability to pronounce magisterially on the merit of a work dealing with so high a theme. We recommend to all persons, therefore, who are accustomed to eat, or who possess brains, to examine and decide for themselves, premising that the exterior style of the work is worthy the house that issues it.

A Sequel to Ministering Children. By MARIA LOUISA CHARLESWORTH. Author of "Ministering Children," "England's Yeomen," "Sunday Afternoons in the Nursery," etc. 12mo., pp. 428. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The great popularity of Mrs. Charlesworth's first work will command a large acceptance of this sequel. Sequels seldom equal their antecedents; and even when intrinsically equal, they scarce can reproduce the first sensation. We commend this attempt at such an achievement to a fair hearing.

Father Clement. A Roman Catholic Story. By the author of "The Decision," "Profession is not Principle," etc. 12mo., pp. 246. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Venetian Life. By W. D. HOWELL. Second edition. 12mo., pp. 401. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

Records of Five Years. By GRACE GREENWOOD, author of "History of My Pets," "Recollections of My Childhood," "Merry England," etc. 12mo., pp. 222. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

Curfew Chimes; or, Thoughts for Life's Eventide. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D., author of "Morning and Night Watches," "Memories of Bethany," etc. Second edition. 16mo., pp. 71. 1867.

The Great Pilot and his Lessons. By the Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D.D., author of "Rills from the Fountains of Life," "The Best Things," etc. 12mo., pp. 309. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Story of Martin Luther. Edited by MISS WHATELY. 12mo., pp. 354. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Two Marriages. By the author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," "Christian's Mistake," etc. 12mo., pp. 301. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Frederick the Great and his Court. An Historical Romance. By L. MUHLBACH, author of "Joseph II. and his Court." Translated from the German by Mrs. CHAPMAN COLEMAN and her Daughters. 12mo., pp. 434. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood. By GEORGE MAC DONALD, M.A. 12mo., pp. 311. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Village on the Cliff. By Miss THACKERAY, author of "The Story of Elizabeth." 8vo., pp. 104. Harper & Brothers.

The Tent on the Beach, and other Poems. By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. 16mo., pp. 172. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

Letters to a School-Boy. By his Father. 12mo., pp. 208. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Good Report. Morning and Evening Lessons for Lent. By ALICE B. HAVEN. 12mo., pp. 318. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

Scripture Baptism Defended, and Anabaptist Notions Proved to be Antiscriptural Novelties. By Rev. JOHN LEVINGTON. 12mo., pp. 242. Chicago: Poe & Hitchcock. 1866.

Religious Poems. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. With Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 107. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

Walking in the Light. By DANIEL DANA BUCK, D.D. 16mo., pp. 104. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1867.

The Satisfactory Portion. By Rev. A. C. GEORGE. 16mo., pp. 107. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1867.

Two valuable volumes on practical piety from able pens.

CARLTON & PORTER are issuing very valuable additions to our Sunday-school literature, among which are the following:

What is a Child? or, The Properties and Laws of Child-Nature stated and illustrated. By WILLIAM H. GROSER, B.Sc., F.G.S. 16mo., pp. 63.

The Art of Securing Attention in a Sunday-School Class. By JOSHUA FITCH, M.A., Principal of Normal College, British and Foreign School Society. From the London Edition. 16mo., pp. 44.

Two Years with Jesus. First Year: Historic Outline, Journeys, and Miracles. Prepared for Scholars of the Third Grade. By J. H. VINCENT. 16mo., pp. 64.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1867.

Art. I.—SCRIPTURE INSPIRATION.

The Inspiration of Holy Scripture: its Nature and Proof. Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By William Lee, A. M., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. New York: Carter & Brothers.

Essays and Reviews. New York: Appletons.

Replies to Essays and Reviews. New York: Appletons.

Aids to Faith: a Series of Theological Essays. Appletons.

A Collection of Theological Essays from Various Authors, with an Introduction by Geo. R. Noyes, D. D., Prof. of Sacred Literature in Harvard University. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

Commentary on Matthew and Mark. By William Nast, D. D. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock.

The Greek Testament, with Notes by Dean Alford. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry. By Isaac Taylor. New York: Rudd & Carleton.

The Radical; a Monthly Magazine devoted to Religion. Boston.

Essays. By Ralph Waldo Emerson. Ticknor & Fields.

The inspiration of the Scriptures is the corner-stone of Christian doctrine. Without it the forms of true faith would crumble and disappear, for they could have no ground for their support. Appeals to consciousness, or tradition, or any other tribunal, would be instantly met by counter appeals to different declarations of consciousness and tradition, and the mind would drift powerless among the contending ice-floats of human imagination, feeling, and opinion.

An inquiry, therefore, into the ground and character of this inspiration, is one of the most important topics that can address the mind of man. Two branches this inquiry naturally assumes :

I. Considerations, *a priori*, in favor of inspiration.

II. Its real nature and degree.

First. What grounds have we for considering inspiration necessary in any divine system of faith?

The basis of all truth is twofold: that revealed to the consciousness, and that revealed to the senses. Nature, in the earth and the universe, is a reality, undisturbed by the unrealism of Berkeley and Schaupenhauer. The eye, and other organs of communication between the soul and its dwelling-place, transmit convictions of the reality of the objects they recognize, as positive, as unanswerable, as those which arise from the central depths of the spirit's own being. They speak of that which they do know, and the soul unhesitatingly receives their testimony.

On the other hand, the spirit of man testifieth to itself. In its own secret and intercommunion it asserts certain things as true. Its own existence, independent of, and superior to, the body, is perhaps the most central of these spiritual truths. It is the vital point. Were it not for that, the soul would be swallowed up by the body. We should have no selfhood, no spiritual sense, no moral nor conscious nature. It is probable that such is the fact in respect to the spirit of the beast that goeth downward. It is not a self-discerning spirit. It looks to the body as the center of its life, works blindly the will of the bodily appetites, and is absorbed by the fleshly nature. It rises not into the realm of conscious being, and is not, therefore, reasoning, moral, immortal. Born with the body, it obeys its behests as faithfully as the waves the moon.

Who ever saw a beast, even the most intelligent, seek to restrain its appetite from gratification? It will adopt every means, on the contrary, to secure its indulgence, as the choked river among the hills will wind in every manner to find an outlet. And if the appetite is unsatisfied, so far from repressing it, through every tie of duty, love, or obedience, of parental or filial instinct, it will break, even as the same obstructed river madly

tears its path through ripening fields, through homes of culture and affection, regardless alike of happiness and of life, so that it may obey the domination of its own imperious nature and reach the haven of its desires.

These lower creatures, then, lack this spiritual counselor against the pressure of instinct, this reviser and represser of brutality. Their spirits are jackals to the beastly lion of the body. Man, on the contrary, has a soul that declares to him the reality of its own existence; its relations to the body, in which it condescends to abide for a little season, as its guide, companion, and master; its relations to the past and future, to the visible and invisible, to the temporal and eternal, to himself, his fellow-creatures, and, far above all, and infinitely above the possibility of brute spirit, to God—creator, preserver, deliverer.

Beyond this highest height there is a higher height the soul of man attains. Not alone does it discover God. It converses with him. The intimacy of Adam and his Creator, broken off by sin, is renewed in Christ. His Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits. The soul sees, hears, talks with God. The only possible meaning of prayer is this communion. It would be mockery and insanity did not God and the human soul then meet and converse together.

The fact, therefore, of the soul's existence and movements is as well founded as that of the existence of the material universe. It knows its own workings as certainly as it does that of the body it inhabits. It sees God with the same clearness and assurance that it sees the earth and sky.

Now Christianity being the work of the same God who created the soul and the body, the material earth and the spiritual heavens, it is established on precisely the same foundations that these rest upon. It has an earthly body, it has a spiritual body. Being designed for man, it is especially adapted to his twofold nature. It has an inward and an outward being: a body and a soul.

> 'Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
> Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet."

Its chief revelation is, however, directly to the heart and the mind, without any connection with outward media. Without reading a book, or hearing a voice, or seeing a form, the penitent soul may draw nigh unto God; may be conscious of his

justifying grace, of a peace that passeth even its own understanding, of a joy in communion that is inexpressible in its tenderness and glory.

This inward expression of Christianity surpasses the outward as greatly as spirit excels matter. It is the profound, the indestructible life of Christianity. Its outward forms may be suppressed by persecution, its written word may be hidden from the eyes of the believer in the vail of an unknown tongue, or by the power of hostile rulers. Yet spirit will blend with Spirit, the creature converse with the Creator, and Christianity still live, a fountain sealed but not dried up; a fountain, fresh, sweet, eternally upspringing, and ready, when the seal is broken, to break forth in channels, and make the earth where it flows a paradise. Christianity, therefore, in its ultimate solution and central vitality, like prayer, is

> "The soul's sincere desire,
> Uttered or *unexpressed;*
> *The motion of a hidden fire*
> That trembles in the breast."

But God has not chosen to confine himself to this mode of manifestation. He has provided this gospel a body as it hath pleased him. He hath put his religion into a form apprehensible by the out-looking faculties of the soul; a form that stands among other visible works of man and of God as clear, authoritative, and divine as the mountains among the man-made cities that crouch at their feet, or as the ocean around the man-driven ships that rock on its waves. It is thus ordained of God that if man dare deny the existence of His works he must, with the same breath, deny those of his own hands.

The same law rules in the higher realm of grace. Whoever shall deny the divinity of Christianity in its revealed forms, by the very force of his own nature is compelled, if rational and consistent, to deny the corresponding but infinitely inferior revelations of his own inward spiritual life.

In two ways the ideas of man permanently seek expression: in organization and in language. These are almost simultaneous in origin and development. His thoughts that breathe must be embodied in words that burn; a seemingly more, but really less intense expression of the inexpressible. They must

none the less take on the form of action. They must organize societies around their focus, or rather develop such organisms from this vital center. They must blossom into customs, habits, buildings, institutions, every form of outward beauty and efficiency. Thus the idea of the divine right of kings has found expression in books, palaces, pomp, and power. Thus the counter idea of the divine rights of man is becoming clothed upon with language, law, arms, and nationality.

Even so Christianity has a twofold expression of its ineffable fullness and vitality. It takes the shape of worship and of word; of Church or kingdom; and of language or literature. It puts on the goodly apparel of vestments. It flowers into the highest art of the painter and sculptor. It bursts forth in the wondrous majesty of architecture; in the tabernacle, in the temple, in the sublimer beauty of the cathedral. These are its outermost forms of worship. The inner and finer wrappings of this spirit are the bowed head, the lifted voice, the unspotted life, the active service of love.

Antichrist seeks to organize mankind into sects and constituencies. Christ organizes his disciples into a congregation or Church, which shall offset this mighty power of numbers. He calls this company, "the pillar and ground of the truth." Not the truth itself—that is spiritual, and cannot be affected by numbers—but its supporters and revealers. They represent its numerical or voting power. They are the popular tests of the divinity of the gospel. The suffrages of the race, without regard to color or condition, shall thus declare the sovereignty of Christ against that of Satan. Even if many of these voters are themselves bad men, utterly destitute of inward and real Christianity, like many wicked supporters of political truth, they acknowledge thus the truth of the gospel, whose renewing power they personally refuse. Thus many of the popes and their subjects, as well as the irreligious portion of Protestant communities, support the claims of Christ against idolatry and infidelity.

But while this general suffrage may concede his kingly rights, they cannot be truly said to be the body of the Christian soul. Only the true Church can be the true outgrowth. And only when this mass of individual adherents becomes thoroughly transformed by the power of the endless life within, will the

Church be the all-prevailing, all-perfect form and likeness of the indwelling God, the Holy Ghost.

But the Church is not its only outward revelation. Mankind are affected by numbers; they are yet more by ideas. The Church, like the State, must be inspired and uplifted by thought. These ideas must take the form of language. They must enunciate law, sing praises, and mould themselves into biography and history. These revelations the Gospel makes of itself, and their combined form it calls the book—the word, the letter of God. Thus, when Satan might appeal to his multitude of worshipers for proof of his kingliness, Christ appeals to his as a superior proof of superior claims. When the enemy sets forth his falsehoods in the form of argument, creed, song, and story, his divine adversary is ready with this counter statement, argument, life, and law. He not only enters the forum and the hustings, he enters the schools and the libraries. If man dares to deny, as how often he has, the ability and act of divine composition, he will thus, by the same word, deny his own. For God's book was written and published ages before the first of his. The very book in which he may attempt to deny the possibility of a divine writing, proves the impossibility of his own; for all his powers of thought and of expression, his faculty of writing and printing, are from God himself, who can as easily do for his own ends of infinite greatness what he allows man to do for his objects of infinitesimal triviality. Thus the foundation of God standeth sure by the very necessity he has laid upon his enemies to build their own structures on the same foundations.

The Bible is therefore the second essential expression of Christianity. It is the body of Christian truth; the outer intellectual form of the inner life; the testimony to the world of that experience which every renewed nature receives directly from God. It is as essential to our present existence as is the body to our earthly existence. As the soul cannot act, nay, cannot remain in this world, without a body, no more can Christianity be a power in the earth and among men without an outer oracle. The sinful soul doth not discern the things of the Spirit. The world that lieth in the wicked one would deny and despise the testimonies of sanctified ones. Hence God enters their own arena, conforms to their own ways of

procedure, puts his polling booth alongside of theirs—his printing press, his school, his poetry, oratory, logic, philosophy, his heroes and heroines, his histories, constitutions, communities.

Therefore it becomes absolutely necessary that He should write a book. In it should he set forth such thoughts and facts as he may deem it desirable that man should know. As the author seeks to impress his convictions upon the reader, and does not accept the latter as a partner in his work, either as to the suggestion of topic or treatment, so the Author of this Book does not take counsel with his readers as to what or how he shall write, but is solely anxious to enlighten them with his own opinions expressed in his own way.

In his book we thus find him communicating directly with man. He gives him that most interesting of all histories to a human being, his genealogy. He adds that hardly less fascinating knowledge, the origin of the home he inhabits. What man desires not to know his first ancestor, and the first homestead of his family? How powerful is this passion even for the few generations through which but few can trace their stream of being. Had we not the Bible, the pages of Hesiod and Apollodorus, as well as the custom of all heathen rulers to ascribe their origin to their gods, show how great would be our curiosity, and how absurd the conclusions of our scrutiny.

Beginning with these most alluring subjects to the human mind, it instantly shows the divinity of its authorship by rising from the sphere of mere earthly science and family pride, into the relations of those souls to their Maker. "Let us make man in Our image. In the image of God made He him." It as instantly gives the absolute equality of every individual, despite all natural or enforced distinctions, in its next word: "Male and female created He them." From the high position as the children of God, he proceeds to show how they fell, and how they were rescued from its immediate consequences; introducing in this narrative the two great agencies, unseen and superior to man, that are concerned in his history; introducing also the mode by which the Divine deliverer shall rescue man through the interposition of Himself. Thus was set forth in the opening chapters the seven most important facts that man could need or wish to know: his origin, his birthplace, his dependence on God, his independence of his fellow, his

adversary, his fall, his Saviour. These three chapters introduce the volume. They are the proem of the epic, or the first chorus of the drama, which give a synopsis of the whole work. No matter how many years the Author may be in completing his work; no matter how many volumes it may ultimately include, they are all summed up in this introductory chapter. Thus Gibbon declared a purpose, in the first page of his history, that it took him twelve years to complete, and that covered thirteen centuries of time. Thus Adam Clarke began a task in 1794 that he did not fully finish in nearly forty years. Thus Bancroft and Herbert Spencer are engaged yet on intellectual works which their prefatory chapters lay out, and which have already absorbed nearly forty years of the life of the former,* and may yet a longer portion of that of the latter, ere they can say as did Gibbon, "I may now congratulate my deliverance from a long and laborious service." If a creature whose limit of labor rarely reaches half a century may thus grapple with undertakings which demand a quarter, or a half, or even all of that time to complete, is it not eminently easy for the Author of the Book, whose goings forth are from eternity, to occupy two or more thousands of years in elaborating the plan he sets forth in his introductory chapter?

That elaboration will include the history of this redemption as it discloses itself in the lives of individuals, of families, of nations, as it contends with opposing powers of error, as it exhibits itself in superhuman and supernatural events, or moulds itself into systems of worship and a code of laws. It will include also such truths respecting the nature and destiny of man, on and beyond the earth, the unseen worlds of spirits, good and evil, the nature and operations of Deity beyond the reach of human knowledge, as may be deemed by the Author essential to the perfect unfolding of his plan. In its style it will be likely to include all the varieties of composition that attract the attention or exhibit the capacity of man. The historic, the dialectic, the proverbial, the lyric, the narrational, the dramatic—whatever mode of expressing thought or feeling is within the scope of the human mind, that mode will find its best illustration in the Book of God; for he is the source of its

* In 1834 his first volume was published, "the result," we are told, even then, "of a long matured purpose."

capacity in man, and therefore can, as well as must, exhibit its fullness in his own word.

We might adduce, as an additional proof of this necessity, the fact that all false systems of any degree of development have embodied their claims and laws in language. God's enemy has written *his* book. The Vedas of the Brahmans are among the most ancient of these heretical compositions. The Hermes Trismegistus professes to be the utterances of Egyptian gods. "The Bana," which means "The Word," is the title of the sacred writings of the Buddhists. Teutonic idolatry had its Bible. Greece had her Oracles, the authority of whose most carefully worded responses exceeded that of any of her Pericles or Alexanders. The Sybilline books ruled the Romans, the only power whose sovereignty they acknowledged. So Mohammed, when he would organize his ambition into a sect, is compelled to write a Koran; and modern heresies, however refined and debasing, are constrained to take the form of words. Error becomes supernaturally natural in Emerson's exquisite sentences, where every word is weighed like diamond dust in the balances of expression. It becomes visionary in Swedenborg, intolerably verbose in Jackson Davis, and coarsely barbaric in Joe Smith. But, whatever name it assumes, it is ever compelled to manifest itself in a book.

A still higher proof could be drawn from that profoundest of all revelations, the nature of God himself. But as that revelation is disclosed only in his Book, it can hardly be considered an *à priori* consideration. Yet, as confirmation of those proofs which nature, man, and both true and false religions advance, it may, perhaps, rightfully appear in this connection. The expression which the invisible God employs to convey to the creature the fact of his own manifestations is the Logos, or Word. The very essence of his nature and express image of his person is THE WORD. The full significance of this statement, no creature, however exalted, can ever understand. But that it means to convey to our minds the fact that God reveals himself in an outer form, to which he assigns this most significant name, cannot be denied. Though it does not affect his eternal tripersonality, yet his manifestation of himself is thus set forth in the words his own Spirit employs, an unanswerable confirmation of the law that obtains in all lesser being. The

invisible God, invisible to his highest angels no less than to his lowest creatures, invisible by the constitution of his own being, bringeth himself, in the person of his Son, into the world, "and when he bringeth forth his only-begotten, he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him." This eternal Son is styled, The Word. This declaration has yet further and most important bearings on the subject; but for the present we limit its import to the point we are considering, and we deduce from the necessity that God himself should reveal himself in a visible form, the highest expression and the most unanswerable proof, that all his works, made in his image, must be subject to this law. As Christ is the manifestation of the infinite God, so, though in an infinitely less degree, do nature and man body forth the inner and unseen higher nature and higher man. So do the Church and the Bible show forth the divinity that dwells within them.

But these considerations are only the portal to the truth, the foundations of the temple that must be erected. It is not so much a prophecy, dumb or distinct, of the need and naturalness of an inspired volume, that creates controversy among men. It is the *fact* that such a volume *exists*, claiming such an origin, with authority correspondent, which has always, and will more and more awaken the animosity of the foes of truth, and compel divisions even among its friends. It is most natural that such a result should happen. A work so lofty in its claims, so essential to the success of the Gospel, will of course be disputed as to its authorship and authority. It will be assailed by every weapon of logic or rhetoric, of malice and ridicule. It will be undermined by flattery or by subtlety. The differences of its various copies will be multiplied and magnified. Its scientific statements will be opposed professedly in the interests of science. Its doctrines will be eviscerated, or declared unworthy of enlightened ages. Its ethics and politics, philosophy and poetry, facts and figures, will all, by feeble friends or foul foes, become the subjects of solemn or sarcastic assault.

Chief of these attacks in frequency and persistency will be that which denies its authorship. This is the seat of its strength. If it can be driven from this; if it can be made to share it with human works, if it can be shown by any array of difficulties that the doctrine is untenable, the deed is done. *The* Word of

God becomes *a* word of man, and its especial, supreme, sole authority among all other writings instantly and forever ends.

This subject is, therefore, most essential to our religion. They stand or fall together. This every enemy, if not every ally, sees. Let us gather around this Book, blackened with the smoke of a million battles, yet unmarred by their assaults, and strengthen ourselves with the divine power that eternally dwells within it.

We shall feel as we enter upon the examination, that no brief essay can compass its fullness. To explore its lengths and breadths and depths and heights would require ages and capacities such as belong not to time and man. It is like attempting to explore the realm of nature with our little mind, in our little moment. Nay, it is more foolish. For the Bible, if it be what it must be, according to its claims, is far fuller of divinity than nature. It has far profounder truths, far wider relations, far greater facts, far stranger mysteries. The great scholars of nature bow reverently before her multitudinous marvels. They confess that they discern but parts of her ways, and say with their inspired predecessor in this field, who rightly recognizes nature as a revelation of God, "The thunder of His power who can understand!" They declare they are but lucky children finding a few pearls on the shore of the illimitable, unfathomable sea. They modestly refuse to sit in judgment on its central realities. What know they of life? Why and how it assumes so many forms? What is the substance of the worlds? What is the age of the earth? What of the inhabitableness of the stars? What is matter? what, spirit? Some of these they attempt approximatively to answer. Of some, and by far the most and greatest, they exclaim, "We are of yesterday, and know nothing!"

And yet some of these same scholars, so humbly prostrate before nature, presume to ignore or domineer over the Word of God. Like all idolaters, they worship the creature more than the Creator; they worship the one and despise the Other. Its statements they do not regard as worthy of their attention. Their inquiries are not to be affected by its assertions. No reverence makes them uncover their feet or head as they approach its sacred pages. They treat it with the coldest neglect, with the haughtiest disdain.

Thus they demean themselves toward what? A far sublimer work and word of God than that they so faithfully revere. The Bible, if it be what it claims, is the higher complement of the book of creation. It is the spiritual as that is the material revelation of God. It is far more abundant than the latter in obstacles to its complete subjugation to the human comprehension, far more rewardable to its faithful students in knowledge and wisdom. It is higher than the heights above, deeper than the depths beneath. It dwells upon the workings of God in his spiritual universe, his creation and government of souls, not worlds; his treatment of souls fallen and unfallen; his operations to save the lost, without weakening the foundations on which the sinless can abide humble and holy. What is the subsidence or elevation of continents, the age of Niagara or Amazon, the number of genera or species of fishes, the mutual relation and interdependence of the animal races, from mollusc to man—what are such inquiries beside the themes of revelation?

But as this field is utterly inexplorable, let us confine ourselves to that which is the center of the whole investigation, without which the mighty fabric, like

> "The great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
> And, like an unsubstantial fabric faded,
> Leave not a rack behind."

Second. In what sense, and to what degree, are the Scriptures inspired? There are many shades of belief on this subject, but they can all be reduced to three:

1. The Bible is inspired in nature, precisely like every book of man.

2. It is divinely inspired, but rather as a supervision of human minds to keep them from error, than as the express utterance of the mind of God.

3. It is directly and entirely written by God, these penmen being co-workers, but sub-workers, with him.

Two others might be included—that which denies inspiration altogether, and that which confers the extremest inspiration upon some parts, and the supervisional on the rest of the book. But the first of these denies it entirely, and can therefore be hardly said to be a doctrine of inspiration; while the second, as it grants the highest order of inspiration to a portion, and

that portion, also, the Gospels, about which the battle rages most violently, is embraced in its difficulties, and must stand or fall with it.

I. The first of these theories is the ruling dogma of the heterodoxy of to-day. It is stoutly advocated by the leaders of all outside faiths, pantheistic, rational, or "spiritual," so called. Every school of skepticism cleaves to this opinion. Emerson and Parker are one in this theory, and one in sympathy and substance with Jowett, Davidson, Williams, Colenso, and such apostate doctors of the English Church.

Inspiration, they declare, is the common gift to every mind. All have it in a larger or less degree, according to their capacity; but some may have more of it than any of the bibliographers. The Hebrew writers were some of them in the highest order of mind, some of them in inferior ranks; but all were inspired no more and no less than those of their own capacity in other lands, and lines of thought. Shakspeare and David, Plato and Isaiah, Homer and Job, are as constitutionally identical as Shakspeare and Homer and Plato are, apart from their Hebraist kinsmen. These writers are one in nature and afflatus with all other geniuses, Phidias, Raphael, Cicero, Cesar. The difference between them is that other men of might have their genius directed to lower ends—art, war, poetry, statesmanship, in a word, the humanities, while that of the Hebrews was turned toward religion and God. It is only the difference between a glass sweeping the horizon and the same glass turned to the upper heavens; a difference of elevation, not of nature. The eye is still human, still unchanged, still imperfect; but it is the only medium of communication between the outer world and the soul. No different light streams in upon that soul from the celestial than the terrestrial objects. At least, the light has no transmuting power over the organ of vision. There was no extraordinary occupation of the Bible-writing minds by the Divine Spirit; no sights nor utterance that they could not attain by the natural expansion of their own powers under the afflatus of the high and holy ideas which they were evolving.

In this sphere too they were on the same level with other seers of moral and religious truth in all climes and ages. Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates, Anaxagoras, Epictetus, Orpheus, Seneca, Swedenborg, and themselves, are all one with

Moses, Ezekiel, Paul, and John. Mr. Emerson, the greatest and most consistent writer of this school, beside whom Strauss, Rénan, Parker, and Colenso are but pigmies in genius and in daring, calls them and their works all by one name.

He clearly considers himself as belonging to the same school, and expects that his brilliant oracularisms on the highest topics of God and man will rank with Job and Solomon, Isaiah and John. He seeks diligently for bits of wisdom in Hafiz, Saadi, the Purana, and the Shastas. He sweeps their muddy streams with his clear, cold, patient eye, and gathers every diamond, however defective and however imbedded in Serbonian mud, and puts them beside the words of Jesus as though they were of like origin and authority. Nay, more; he presumes to consider himself as the superior of them all, Jesus included, on the theory that a man who masters another is indeed his master. If by hard studying one can understand Plato, then is he the superior of Plato. This theory is set forth with sharp-drawn distinctness in his essay on History, but is condensed into its opening motto:

> "I am the owner of the sphere,
> The seven stars, and the solar year;
> Of Cæsar's hand and Plato's brain,
> Of Lord Christ's heart and Shakspere's strain."

The man who could write that last line without remorse, is a fit representative of a theory which places the Bible in its authorship on the same level as all other books.

Behind the mystagogue walk all the less capacious minds that adopt this dogma as their own. Maurice, Powell, Williams, Jowett, in the English Church, Parker, Frothingham, Noyes, in American pulpits, have grasped at this theory more or less boldly as the remover of the difficulties that block their path. Maurice declares that "the inspiration of the Scriptures is generically and essentially like that of poets, and the quickening and informing spirit to which all good men ascribe their own enlightenment."* Baden Powell says, there is no "foundation in the Gospels or Epistles for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration."† The Evangelists and apostles do not "anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from

* See Aids to Faith, p. 344.

† Essays and Reviews, pp. 379, 380.

error and infirmity."* Jowett says: "Nor for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels and Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them, different from that of the preaching or teaching which they daily exercised; nor do they anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity.†"

Williams, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, "protests against that unwise exaggeration which makes the entire Bible a transcript of the Divine Omniscience;"‡ and warns his hearers not to "ascribe infallibility to men of like passions with ourselves,"§ and not "to sever, as they did not sever, their inspiration from that of the congregation at large."‖

The American pupils of this master go much farther in their statements. Mr. Frothingham, one of the latest and most pronounced of this school, puts the Bible on precisely the same footing as other books, though he confesses his position is "*fundamentally* opposed to the faith of Christendom."¶ And while denouncing in almost passionate terms any especial reverence for the Book, or especial distinction above its fellows, he follows the path of his leader in his view of its inspiration. "As for inspiration, instead of being denied it is more emphatically and comprehensively affirmed, for it is held to belong to all writings of high spiritual character; nay, far more than that, it is held to be an attribute of all creative intellect in its moods of moral elevation."** Well may he conclude his dissertation by the declaration that he "reads the Bible as any other book; criticises it; judges it; but expects no superhuman wisdom from it, and will not call it the Word of God, or the book in which the words of God are especially written."††

We need quote no farther testimony as to the opinions of this class of thinkers. Nor need we present any argument against them, save one, and that Mr. Frothingham frankly confesses. It is "fundamentally opposed to the faith of Christendom." It sprang not from that faith. It will as certainly

* Essays and Reviews, pp. 379, 380. † Ibid.

‡ Noyes's Essays, pp. 133, 145. See also same volume, by the same, "The Spirit and the Letter; or, the Truth and the Book." § Ibid. ‖ Ibid.

¶ The "Radical," August, 1866, p. 449. ** Ibid., p. 454. †† Ibid., p. 498.

stifle it, if it is inhaled by it, as azote destroys the life that inspires it. It is at instinctive and utter variance with our central thought: the union, correlation, and identification of the Christian experience and the Christian record, of the letter and the spirit, of the Word and the work of God. To this touchstone it is brought, and one trial proves its falsity. What need have we of further testimony? Put upon your specimen a drop of acid and it instantly loses its luster. It is enough. The gold is naught but pyrites. No need of smelter and crucible and other subtler tests. Cast it out. So this theory never feeds a hungry soul; never gratifies a holy taste; never cultivates a true faith, or a perfect character. It is enough. It is proved by its effect. No man can embrace it that does not instantly or gradually reject every fundamental doctrine of that Book. One can believe this of Homer and yet relish his imagination, and not distrust his statements, so far as they are historical, geographical, or illustrative of the habits of his times. He can believe it of Shakspeare and not become skeptical of his highest ideas. So one can of the moralists and philosophers of the world—Socrates, Aristotle, Xenophon, Plutarch, Quintilian. It does not destroy their veracity to consider them thoughtful students of the great problems of human nature and destiny. But let one extend this theory over the Bible, and it not only ceases to be a separate, it ceases to be an equal book. Like all in highest seats, if it falls, it plunges far below the lowest seats. It ceases to have their confidence and then their respect. Mr. Emerson daintily sets the gems of Persia and India in his pictures of silver. He never sets there a scripture verse. Though once its professed teacher, he has totally forgotten its lore. He paraphrases Psalm cxxxix, and calls it "Brahma." He takes pride in conferring honor on the pagan guesses at truth, and pouring contempt on the elder and clearer Hebrew utterers of the same and greater truth. Rarely can a word eulogistic of the Bible be found in his writings. Rarely a word laudatory of Christ, except as a man of deep and tender sentiments. He represents the class. All with unequal step follow hard after him.

Most less serenely tread the Arctic Sea. They waver, they shrink. They look back like Lucifer on the divine plains they are abandoning with some twinges of remorse, with part-

ing benedictions to the happy fields. They still praise its pathos or poetry after they scorn its veracity and authority. They strive to carry with them the peace that the earlier and better doctrine imparted, but strive in vain. Their writings evince their feelings. Colenso confesses his distress. So does Strauss. They feel that the Scriptures are leaving them. It holds no communion with such flatterers. It sees through their unbelief, and covers itself from their eyes. Then they plunge into all manner of disbelief concerning it. The book ceases to be respected. It is buffeted, spit upon, scourged, sawn asunder. Its statements are denied, its professions despised, its doctrines set at naught. Does it declare a systematic order of creation through six periods of time? They treat its declaration with superciliousness. Does it describe a deluge that covered the habitable earth, and submerged all the human race but one family? They gravely charge its records with falsehood. Does it give a sober synopsis of the enslavement, emancipation, and nationalizing of the Hebrew people? They seek to pick innumerable flaws in the narrative, and to reduce the whole to a not cunningly devised fable. They go farther. Its doctrines they especially reject. Does the Bible teach the fact of a vicarious sacrifice as the basis of man's regeneration? How they scorn the doctrine, and nickname it "the sacrificial theology." Does it declare man's depravity and destruction without the grace of God in Christ? They scout it as a brain-sick fancy. Does it assert a future state of rewards and punishments, based on our earthly and voluntary relation to Christ? They deny alike our probationary condition, our dependence on Christ for salvation after death, and the existence of eternally separated states in that future world. In fact, *every* vital doctrine of the Word of God falls to the ground when the especial inspiration of the Scriptures is rejected. All that makes it actually valuable to the human soul as a revealer of its condition, the cause, the consequences, and the cure, is sneeringly or soberly rejected. They have robbed the salt of its savor, and they have nothing left wherewith to season it. They therefore readily cast it out and tread it under impudent or careless feet. True, they profess to admire some of its sayings and some of its characters. They call Isaiah "the most inspired of men." They admire the grandeur of the Revela-

tor, but it is as they would a comely face. They reject the thoughts of these admirable writers, and pre-eminently despise their gifts and their gospel. Some of them are especially profuse in adulations of Him they have betrayed; they are prostrate in admiration before an idol their own hands have undeified and mutilated. For all this profession and prostration is accompanied with a denial of his most avowed and most solemn claims, and with unbelief in his most frequent and most important utterances. Their Bible is not only "Hamlet," with Hamlet left out. It is Hamlet with Hamlet denied ever to have existed.

While the weaker infidel still clings to a godless Bible and an undeified Christ, their leaders carry their reasoning to its legitimate conclusions. They treat the Bible as The London Quarterly says Strauss should have treated it, after his fancied destruction of its authenticity. It is to them "a closed book for evermore." They have turned from "the reproachful record of their greatest delusion." Thus we have seen Emerson, and Thoreau, and the American skeptic boldly discard the shrine from which they have expelled the God. Thus will all follow them who dare to follow the like views of inspiration to their natural necessary result.

This fate, as we have seen, does not overtake any other work thus relegated to a human origin. We do not disbelieve the geography of the Odyssey because we fail to believe with the early Greeks in its inspiration. We do not deny the leading doctrines of Plato because we refuse to call him divine. How happens it that this distinction awaits the Bible alone? Because we take away its foundation. Its infallible and exclusive inspiration is the only basis on which its authority or influence can stand. It can share its honors with no other book, even as its author, the divine Logos, can share his with no other god. The Pantheon must be his all in all, or not at all. So the Bible stands in the library. It alone must be worshiped. It only is divine. It falls and Christ falls with it, if it dare to share its throne with that of man, however pure and perfect be his genius and his strain.

To this objection against this theory no others need be added. It is not necessary thrice to slay the slain. If it extracts from the Bible its whole power, denies its statements and doctrines, and makes it a careless work for friendly or unfriendly study

or neglect, the question in debate is concluded. Whoever goes thus far, if consistent, will go farther. He will and ought to cease to study or use it as a text-book, or even to respect such a farrago of nonsense and lies. Better far preach from Homer or Shakspeare, for they make far less pretensions, and far less claims upon our credulity.

The ground out of which this theory springs is plausible, though shallow. It ignores sin and guilt, a fall and redemption, and puts every soul *ab origine* and inseparably *en rapport* with its Maker. It catches at those better influences which arise in every mind, through the gift of Christ, who is the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, and asserts that these gleams of conscience, these flashes of the eye of God, are the natural, universal, and eternal property of every soul. It steadily refuses to recognize the natural proclivity of the soul to evil, the undertow that controls the current of our being, and therefore refuses to discover any need of an atonement and an Atoner. They need no guide through life, no light from heaven above the brightness of this natural, inward sun, no staff in death, no Daysman at the judgment, no Preserver through eternity. Pure naturalism is the sole and all-sufficient law. Such a thing is in most violent antagonism with Christian faith. Both cannot live in the same soul, cannot endure eternally in the same universe. If entertained, the only result will be the evisceration of Christianity from its believer. Spiritualist, pantheist, fatalist, rationalist, radical, liberal, he may call himself, but not Christian. It can never be adopted by the Church, unless it first ceases to be the Church of Christ.

The other two theories are both esteemed orthodox, and are advocated by separate schools of evangelical thinkers. Between them, however, there is much to choose. And we shall seek to show that the oldest wine is in this case the best; that it, with all its difficulties, the better satisfies the conditions of the problem, and that the objections which lie against it, lie with equal force against its weaker brother; while the latter points and tempts to the outer sea of infidelity, which we have just been exploring.

The two views may be expressed in two words: the Supervisional, and the Verbal. The former considers the Bible writers to have been superintended, so as to be preserved from error,

while allowed a less or larger degree of freedom in the selection of facts and in their expression. The latter believes every word to have been spoken under the inbreathing or impulse of the Holy Ghost. The advocates of the former theory sometimes wrongfully call it the dynamical,* as if in contrast with the true view, which they mistakenly term the mechanical. They also assume for it the title of plenary,† a designation that has long been adopted by verbal inspirationists as their own.

II. 1. Our first objection to this theory is that it originated in opposition to the higher view of infallible verbal inspiration, and not to that of a latitudinarian character. Its chief advocates have much more warmly assailed the former than they have the latter.

That it took its rise from an unwillingness to embrace the higher doctrine, is evident from the concessions of its chief supporters. Coleridge was the fountainhead whence it sprang.

* Lee, [Inspiration of the Scriptures, page 33,] after describing quite correctly the verbal theory, erring, however, in saying "it practically ignores the human element," which it no more does than the true doctrine of Christ practically ignores the human element in his Person, adds, this "has of late years been termed the mechanical theory of inspiration." As he describes the dynamical theory, it will be found to not essentially differ from this: "The dynamic theory of inspiration implies such a divine influence as employs man's faculties according to their natural laws. Man is not considered *in any sense* the cause or originator of the revelation, of which God alone is the source, but human agency is regarded as the condition under which the revelation becomes known to others."—Page 39. He elsewhere rejects the theory "that the subject-matter alone proceeded from the Holy Spirit, while its language was left to the unaided choice of its writers" as "a fantastic notion."—Page 45; see also pages 87, 187, and 190. Yet he does not always adhere to this position; as when he speaks of the prophet "embodying in suitable language the ideas supernaturally infused into his soul."—Page 196. The truth is, verbal inspiration is much more dynamical than the supervisional, for it demands the activity of the whole mind of God and the man in its composition; not an overseership merely.

† Less careful is Alford. After properly defining verbal inspiration, [it is as Lee says, "a consistent intelligible theory,"] he adds: "Plenary inspiration consists in the fullness of the influence of the Holy Spirit especially raising and enabling for the work. The men were full of the Holy Ghost. The books are the pouring out of that fullness through the men, the conservation of that treasure in earthen vessels, in a manner which distinguishes them from all other writers in the world, and their work from all other work. The treasure is ours," [here is the fatal concession,] "*as it only can be*, in the *imperfections* of human speech, in the *limitations of human thought*, in the variety incident at first to *individual character*, and then to manifold transcription and the lapse of ages."—Prologomena of Greek Test., page 21. He thus gives the Bible original as well as subsequent imperfection. Such inspiration is as far from plenary as it is from verbal.

Though it has had advocates in previous ages, and not a few saintly names in its roll, yet it dates its present origin and power to this astute but erratic thinker. Thus, Mr. Browne, in his Essay on Inspiration,* says, "One of the first among ourselves to put forth a bold theory of inspiration was Coleridge. He brings many reasons against a rigid mechanical theory," [such he entitles the verbal theory,] "against a belief that the *Bible is simply the voice of God's Holy Spirit*, uttered through different organs and instruments; but he does not fix any limit; he does not say how far he admits divine teaching or inspiration to extend, nor does he apparently draw any line of distinction between the inspiration of holy men of old and the spiritual and providential direction of enlightened men of every age and nation." Thus it will be seen that he was the father, in modern religious literature, of both theories of inspiration, the non-verbal and non-especial. The latter has been carried to its legitimate results by Emerson and his school. The former is still held as the true doctrine by scholars of undoubted orthodoxy.†

Lee evidently seeks to occupy a middle ground between the supervisionist and the verbalist. His own theory needs but little modification to make it utter the exact truth. He declares that it is his object "to establish all that the supporters of verbal inspiration desire to maintain: namely, the infallible certainty, the indisputable authority, the perfect and entire truthfulness of all and every the parts of Holy Scripture." Yet he earnestly denies "that each word and phrase to be found in the Bible had been infused by the Holy Ghost into

* Aids to Faith, pp. 342–344.

† It may be said that Semler is the founder of this school rather than Coleridge, as their views are not dissimilar. Coleridge says, "Whatever *finds* me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit." And then denies that all of the Bible thus "finds" him, and that what does not is inspired. Semler says, "Whatever I find in Scripture profitable for doctrine and for reproof *to me*, that is theopneustic, or must be referred by me to God the author;" but he adds that he will not dispute with any one who maintains the inspiration of other books of Scripture which he finds of no use to himself. (Reply to Essays and Reviews, p. 418.)

But that the German was not the founder of this school is seen from the fact that it has had no special advocates in Germany, except Tholuck, who refers to Coleridge as one of his chief authorities and not to Semler. He says, "We cannot forbear inserting here the words of a profound writer who has become an intellectual polar star to many inquiring minds in England and America, I mean Samuel Taylor Coleridge." (Noyes's Theol. Essays, p. 97.)

the minds of the sacred writers." He repeatedly opposes all such views, and with far more vigor than he exhibits in confronting the statements of Coleridge or Morell.*

Other writers are less careful in their treatment of this theory and its supporters. Dr. Nast, one of the first of Christian scholars, speaks thus positively: "The theory of what is called verbal inspiration, far from being essential to the divine authority of the Gospel records, is, indeed, as we shall further show, the only ground on which an objection can be brought against their claim of being authentic and authoritative records of a divine revelation; and though this theory of verbal inspiration has been received as if it were tantamount to plenary inspiration, it rests on no Scripture authority, and is supported by no historical testimony, if we except a few ambiguous metaphors of the Fathers."† He thus presents his theory as being chiefly valuable because it is opposed to the more extreme view of equally ardent and able Christian scholars. Dean Alford, whom also he quotes, in his prologomena makes an equally vigorous assault on verbal inspiration. "Much might be said," he says, "of the *à priori* unworthiness of such a theory. . . . I do not hesitate to say, that being thus applied," [to the Gospels,] "its effects will be to destroy the credibility of our Evangelists."‡ He then proceeds to quote an example which we

* What Mr. Morell's views are may be seen in this extract: "Imperfections both in moral and religious ideas are mixed up with all their" [the Hebrew] "sacred writings. Christianity consists not in propositions. Why should we be perpetually craving after a stiff, literal, verbal infallibility?" To the middle of these phrases Dr. Lee objects; not to the first or last. His objection goes much further than his theory, if consistently elucidated, would allow. It is a happy illustration of the true theory. "Few indeed," he says, "will be found to deny that Christianity consists in propositions; as few, perhaps, as would allege that an electric current consists *in* the formulæ by which Gauss or Faraday have expressed its laws. The *knowledge*, however, of what Christianity is, as well as the laws of electricity, *must* be communicated by propositions; and it is not more unnatural that the Christian should 'crave' for an assurance that God's revelation has come to him unclouded by human error, than that the student in the exact sciences should 'crave' for *perfect accuracy* in the structure of the formulæ by which the philosopher from whom he derives his information has expressed the secrets of nature."—Pages 143, 144, Note. What is perfect accuracy in a formula but verbal infallibility in revelation? It should be noticed how carefully he refrains from opposing the chief assault on verbal infallibility. For further proof of the looseness of Mr. Morell's views, consult Aids to Faith, pages 345, 346. They are congenital with Maurice, Semler, Coleridge, and Frothingham.

† Nast's Comm., Prolegom., p. 137. ‡ Prologom. Greek Test., p. 20.

shall consider hereafter. Enough for our present purpose if we see that he is more anxious to demolish the stronghold than to drive back the enemy.

Tholuck writes his essay on this side of the question solely in answer to Professor Gaussen, whose positions he criticizes from the beginning to the end of his article. His essay is properly placed by Mr. Noyes among those opposed to the essential doctrines of the Church and the Word of God.

2. This theory has never awakened the opposition of the enemies of the faith. Bitter are their denunciations of verbal inspiration. In it they see the force that ever confronts their own. The lower regions of supervisional inspiration never awaken their fear or hate. Their clear eye sees that its positions can never stand if the central doctrine fall, that it is so inconsistent with the nature of mind, and so ready to concede the *predominance* of the human element, with all its infirmities, in portions, if not all, of the Word of God, that it can never compel a skeptical philosopher to acknowledge its soundness nor prevent his overthrow of the central truth. For he may well say, "If you declare that errors have been allowed by the sacred penman, you have conceded the main point of defense. The attempt to protect your position by asserting that the Spirit kept them from essential error, will not avail for defense. Who is to be the judge of essential error? Who is to decide where the existing error stands? One may locate it in one spot, another in another; one may extend it largely, the other limit it carefully. What is the final court of appeal?" The skeptic accepts the concession, and presses haughtily forward to the destruction of its entire divinity, despising the porters who have thus unwisely surrendered him the keys. The result which Alford declares to follow the theory of verbal inspiration follows this theory: "Its effect is to destroy the credibility" of the Bible. Its advocates, if hard pressed by our adversaries, which, fortunately for them, they are not, (why should they be?) would have to do as they say the advocates of the ipsissimal theory do: "while broadly asserted, it is in detail abandoned." They cannot agree on "some one manuscript which carries the weight of 'supervisional' inspiration, or some text whose authority shall be undoubted." No two of this school can come as near together as all of the more

orthodox school, much less can they win the outer heretics to their view. With whatever carefulness they seek to guard their treasure, and we concede their conscientious zeal in this matter, when they are asked which is the true sermon on the mount, which the true inscription on the cross, which the true story of the resurrection, they lose all power of discernment, and can only say, "Substantial truth is found in all, and error," which they call unsubstantial, "exists there also." With such arguments how can they contend with the enemies at the gate? They are properly despised and neglected, or else absorbed by the gainsayers.*

3. This theory cuts the nerves of minute study for the harmonizing of the Word. It is as fatal to sound scholarship as to sound doctrine. That scholars and theologians advocate it is no proof of its real effects. They bring with them to their investigation, not this theory, but the old, the divine feeling of its

* It is a noticeable, we may say a remarkable, fact that both of these schools agree almost exactly in their language concerning the condition of the Gospel writers. Thus Alford says: "This treasure is ours, as it only can be ours, in the imperfection of human speech." Elliot, in "Aids to Faith," says: "We may admit therein the existence of such incompleteness, such limitations, and such imperfections as belong even to the highest forms of purely truthful human testimony." Nast says: "Plenary" (by which he means full oversight, not full dictation) "inspiration . . . is not inconsistent even with *inaccuracies*" [the italics are his own] "in matters which all agree in regarding as wholly unimportant." Who the "all" are we are not told. The "Methodist Quarterly Review," vol. x, p. 269, says: "As their infallibility" [the sacred writers'] "is not essential to the authority of the Bible as a system of religious instruction, may we not presume that in these things human infirmity was permitted to err?" This essay also claims that "Jesus was doubtless capable of mistakes," a logical analogy, but which most would shrink from saying. How much do these differ from Jowett and others in their declaration that the writers do not "anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from *error or infirmity?*" (See page 20.) That is, in their writings. In themselves, as men, all grant it. How nearly identical is it with Frothingham's statement of his professor's course with it? "Discrepancies in the history he regretfully allowed. Weaknesses in argument, impertinences in illustration, *non sequiturs* in deduction, slips in allusion, etc., he discerned, noted, and felt no call to apologize for and annul." True, the orthodox doctors protest against any annulling of its authority, because of these "imperfections," but they protest in vain. They are caught in their unwise concession. The ground gives way beneath their feet. They have nothing wherewith to answer. In the words, far more more than in the works, of God

"One step broken, the great scale's destroyed.
Whatever link you strike,
Tenth or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

entire and perfect sacredness, its entire and perfect divinity. They worship at its shrine, they seek to know its full meaning, its intended and real, if hidden harmony. They are orthodox in spite of their outer creed, by the inward culture of the soul in the elder and superior truth. The founders of error are usually nearer the truth than their disciples. "It takes time to develop logical principles." Semler was much more orthodox than his pupils. Channing is far nearer the truth than his two chief children, Parker and Emerson. Ballou had orthodox views of the nature of the atonement, and only separated from the truth as to its extent. His Church to-day deny both. Locke was the father of Hume and Paine. So these Christian scholars who have imbibed this error will find that those who follow them will inevitably separate themselves farther from the truth. They will use their concessions as the lever to force the Bible from its divine foundation. They will dwell upon acknowledged "inaccuracies" as furnishing "illustrations of the conditions and characteristics of human testimony," and will say, *must* say, this theory does not differ radically from that of the Westminster Review, concisely stated by Mr. Frothingham: "What is true in the Bible is to be accepted, because true; and what is untrue, as untrue is to be discarded: *the errors are to be corrected*, and the constituent elements are themselves to be subjected to analysis." *

This result their disciples will assuredly reach. They will advance in the path that is thus sought to be cast up between the scriptural theory and the skeptical, not toward the former, but the latter. The error is not two generations old. It has hardly won its position. If it attains any influence it will inevitably breed yet greater heresy. Sin bringeth forth death. It will destroy accurate and minute scholarship, and make the Bible a subject of only general consideration, and then of no consideration whatever.

4. This theory has no foundation in the nature of the human mind. It is impossible to conceive of a supervisional direction in any human production that shall preserve it from substantial error, and shall yet give full scope to the original faculties of the individual penman. If Napoleon wishes to issue an edict, he does not say to his clerk, "This is the substance of what I

* The Radical, vol. i, p. 454.

wish to say; put it in your language." He is as particular about the expression as about the idea. They are inseparable. The inventor does not say to his apprentice, "Here is my thought, put it in a model of your own;" nor does the sculptor thus speak to his pupil. Idea and form, though not identical, are inseparable. God cannot supervise his book in any partial or plenary manner, and then allow the men who wrote it to say their thoughts in their way, or his thoughts in their way. It is contrary to the laws of mind. If he wrote it, he wrote it; if they wrote it, they wrote it; if, as is true, both wrote it, both *wrote* it. There may be a mysterious, miraculous union of the two natures; for that we have the highest analogy. There can be no supervisional arrangement which does not substantially, and, to the ultimate confession of every thoughtful mind, perfectly remove God from any actual authorship. This argument, which will be considered more fully in its positive instead of this negative form, brings us to the point whence we started.

5. Our whole argument for inspiration is based primarily on the necessity laid upon God to appear in this form among men. If he only superintends human writers, he does not actually reveal himself. He is only present in the book as he was in Abraham, Moses, and David, not as he was in the prophecies of Isaiah, or the person of Christ. All considerations that demand a book of God demand that it be his directly, not indirectly; his personally, not episcopally. The lowest theory of inspiration, in one respect, is in advance of this dogma, for that grants the Bible direct origin from God, though it denies to it any superior, or, at least, supreme degree of this afflatus. It has a groundwork in the reason of man, and can therefore be rationally stated, defended, or opposed. This is without any basis in reason or faith, and is alike rejected of both.

6. The object for which this theory is assumed is not thereby attained. It is adopted to avoid difficulties that attend the higher doctrine. "Statements of the same event cannot be reconciled," it is said. There is no remedy for these differences, in verbal inspiration. Our only refuge is to admit differences, but deny fallibility. It is an ostrich way of escape from the pursuers. It avails naught. Who cares for our pretense of infallibility after we have granted irreconcilability? The rationalist would smile scornfully at such a defense. We

have given him all he asks; he will allow us to still *call* ourselves unconquered.

If the writers are supervisionally preserved from error, then must their records be equally correct. There is but one sermon on the mount. The two reports must be reconciled. There is but one true narrative of the birth or death of Christ. The four reporters must be made to agree. All error here is "substantial." If the Holy Ghost supervised, he should have made Luke and Matthew agree verbally, if it is necessary that such an agreement should obtain in verbal inspiration.

For these reasons, therefore, we are constrained to reject this theory of inspiration. It is a modern theory, having no formal existence till within a century. It is stated honestly, and by devout men, to guard the sacred Scriptures from assault, but actually turns all its guns against the defenders, not the opposers of the word. It has no strength against the foes, and is only embarrassing to the friends of the gospel. It weakens the passion and the power of exact scholarship in what Bengel calls "the native force of the words" (*nativa verborum vis*) of Scripture. It breeds legitimately and irresistibly the very indifference and infidelity that it professes to detest, and that many of its advocates do most heartily detest. It has no foundation in the declarations of the Bible itself, nor in the constitution of the human mind. It actually removes God from the authorship of his word, and gives the Bible less of a real theopneustic, or God-breathing character, than the most violent forms of infidelity allow.

Many problems are unsolved and insoluble on any theory. None are solved by the supervisional that cannot be as easily explained on the higher ground; while no concessions, in the latter case, surrender the whole truth to the doubter, as we see is frequently and legitimately done by those who occupy a lower and less fortified position. We shall show hereafter that this theory answers no end that the other does not better answer. It removes no difficulties, and hence ought never to have been originated.

We have dwelt upon this theory at some length, to the real interruption of our argument, because it is peculiarly an English, and so an American theory. While Semler may have suggested the thought to Coleridge, which is the basal idea of

his "Confessions," the German is not the originator of the theory which some evangelical divines have made their own.* German heresy has taken the form of Emerson, German orthodoxy has not taken that of Tholuck.† Or if it has followed him, its opinions have not given his theory its present prevalence. It is the rather an English *vis media*, an attempt on the part of that ever middle-traveling mind to avoid the extremes of faith and unfaith. Hence its chief advocates are of that nation. Isaac Taylor partly concedes it.‡ Browne, Arnold, Lee, Stanley, Westcott, Alford are among its partial or earnest advocates; while American scholars have followed in their path, and divines of all sects have advocated the dogma, and look askance on Gaussen and the truth. We have quoted only one of the American authors, partly because he is perhaps the clearest in his statement of this view, and partly because his works are accessible to all our readers. That he does not stand alone may be seen in this Quarterly, in an article to which we have referred, written by one of our first thinkers and representatives.

We turn from these views of utter and of partial error to the truth, simple, indestructable. We shall endeavor to show that the reasons which require any Bible, require that it should be verbally inspired; that the nature of language and thought make the same demand; that the instincts of man's nature can be satisfied with no less; that the character of its composition proves it; that the Church in all ages has adopted this as its only doctrine; that the Scriptures themselves affirm it; that no more difficulties attend it than accompany the lower theory, for it overcomes all the obstacles which that attempts to remove, and is strong to resist attacks upon the Word of God with a strength which its rival never possesses; and that wisest advocates of a special inspiration are constrained to take refuge in this doctrine when they would set forth the truth in its simplest and most enduring form.

* "A freeer treatment of this question, namely, the limitation of inspiration to the subject-matter, has from the first, along with individual advocates of a more rigid view, found place in the English Church."—Tholuck: Noyes's, Essays, p. 86. See also Lee on Warburton, pp. 142, 143. Doddridge yielded partially to its influence.

† Hurst on Rationalism, pp. 200, 202. ‡ Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, pp. 342, 344.

Art. II.—THE SANSCRIT LANGUAGE.

It is nearly a hundred years since, under the splendid though often guilty administration of Warren Hastings, India came to be an active partner in the affairs of the modern world. It was supposed to have amassed within itself an inexhaustible material wealth, and thither, as to a newly opened storehouse which ages had been filling, were turned the steps of adventurers in commerce and politics. With these went also, in various capacities, scholars and men of letters. One of these, Mr. Halhed, employing his leisure in curious observation, was astonished to find, in his own words, "a language of the most venerable and unfathomable antiquity now shut up in the libraries of the Brahmans, and appropriated solely to the records of religion, closely resembling the Latin and Greek in its groundwork, its monosyllables, its numerals, and such appellations as would be discriminated on the immediate dawn of civilization." Following Halhed, as the pioneer who first undertook the grammatical study of the language, was Sir William Jones, a poet of high excellence, and widely conversant in Asiatic literature. Many an Englishman in those years returned to display his wealth gained in India; but Sir William Jones and his colaborers surprised and enriched the learned world by bringing out an entire language and literature.

Separate as India had ever been from the life of the Western world, only vague rumors, dating chiefly from the visit of Alexander, and containing little real information, had reached the classic nations. These rumors, though exaggerated into the marvelous, produced no lasting impression, and India had for centuries been, in European eyes, merely as many other lands, available and remunerative to the enterprises of commerce, with a fabulous repute for inexhaustible stores of ancient treasure. Now, however, the announcement that a language had been found, having marked affinity with the classic tongues, and a development in some respects higher than any other, a language apparently traceable to the earliest utterances of the infant world, aroused in many minds a passion for investigation. A graceful translation of the tender and beautiful poem of the Sakuntala by Sir William Jones, much

admired and commended by Goethe, then ruler in the poetic world, awakened lively hopes that riches of poetry, philosophy, and eloquence were now to be added to the known literary treasures of the race. Men of genius and learning, from England, France, and Germany, devoted themselves to the study of the new language, as astronomers to the observation of a new planet. Manuscripts were brought to Europe in large numbers, and three generations of students have employed their energies in this direction. About seven hundred works have been written in exposition and illustration, and at this time the Sanscrit literature is better known in Europe than it has been known in India for the last two thousand years. What was inert and useless on its native soil, has, since its transportation, become a vital and important element in philological science.

We propose to give some outline of the Sanscrit and its literature, and then to venture an inquiry of the practicability and advantage of its introduction as a study into our higher institutions of learning.

The science of comparative philology has developed the history of our race in many directions far beyond any written records. Like the kindred science of geology, it is unable to supply exact dates, yet is perfectly trustworthy in its general deductions. A people is traced by its language to its original dwelling-place. By its linguistic affinities and developments, its relation to other peoples, and its relative time of migration from the common home, are ascertained. In this way the races of Europe—Celtic, Hellenic, Slavic, Teutonic—are shown to have had their common origin among the highlands of Central Asia. Thence, by successive waves of emigration, they removed westward before the dates of their written histories. Near the Asiatic home, probably the last to leave it, remained two of the kindred tribes, the Persians and the Aryans. The latter made their way down the rivers to the southward, and driving out the aborigines, possibly eastward, occupied the great peninsula. The Persians gained the higher lands to the west, and in time gave their kindred a name suggested by the effects of "more indulgent skies," Handu, or Swarthy, and called their country "Handu-stan," "Swart-land." By this name they are known to most other nations, but they call

themselves "Arya." Having remained at home while others departed, and having then removed but a short and easy distance, they may be presumed to have carried with them a large portion of the primitive speech; and, as they had few transitions and revulsions in their subsequent history, so their language met afterward with few important modifications. This language, called afterward the Sanscrita, or the Perfect, and believed by themselves to be of divine origin, is not, indeed, the parent, but the eldest sister of the Persian and European tongues, and bears many marks of being but one remove from that developed by the party, sometimes called the Japhetic, that went northeastward from the dispersion at Babel.

The character of the Sanscrit, in view of its affinity with other languages, is peculiarly interesting. In euphony it has probably no equal. The transition from word to word, and even from syllable to syllable, is made perfectly soft and musical; and thus made agreeable to the ear, it is represented to the eye with perfect accuracy by nearly sixty characters, which unite in writing with a beauty like that with which they blend and harmonize in sound. This euphonic precision causes to the learner greater initial difficulty, but it at length becomes an unfailing source of pleasure. The long combinations, which look so unwieldy, become as brief musical *recitativos*, compared with which the brief, dislocated utterances of our western tongues seem abrupt and chopping. The accentuation also is peculiar. But when the eye and ear have become familiarized to the novel work, a sense of the beautiful continually arises, both from the euphony and the orthography. The Deva-nagari alphabet is inferior in calligraphy to the Arabic only. Equally distinguished is the Sanscrit for its facility of derivation and composition. All the apparent synonyms, "identities with shades of difference," which our English draws from other languages, this is able to form within itself. Only the Greek can in this respect be compared with it. A "dhatu," or root, gives forth a long series of derivatives by means of affixes more palpably significant than those of the Greek, while, as many (especially Donaldson in the New Cratylus) have shown, the affixes of the Greek require comparison with those of the Sanscrit, to which they are closely allied, for their illustration and com-

prehension. These roots are often, and in words of most frequent usage, simply identical with those of European languages. We find our English "father," "mother," "son," "daughter," "cow," "path," and very many others, the same in Sanscrit. Perhaps the pastoral life of our common ancestors is shown by the fact that "daughter" in this early, almost primitive tongue, means "milk-maid."

In etymology the Sanscrit so far surpasses all others, that their systems seem to be only mutilations of its own. Its three genders, three numbers, and eight cases cause the declined word to represent in itself a large variety of relations. The development of verbal forms is perhaps not equal to that of the Greek; but here again the peculiar effect and meaning of the Greek terminations can be realized only by comparison with those of the Sanscrit. This language makes etymology in some sense a substitute for syntax. Its facility in forming compounds, by which the adjuncts are easily moulded into one euphonious word with their subject, (which also adds greatly to the poetic power of the language,) makes formal syntactical arrangements less necessary. Thus, "chatuspari" means "a man who is beaten by four others;" "unmattaganga" means "a place where the Ganges is furious." Sometimes these compounds are interesting, not merely as syntactical contrivances, but associations of ideas. Thus "naka," "heaven," is made of "na" and "ka," (κακος,) meaning "no sin." "Naktam," "night," "na" and "ktam," "no walking." Thus many of our familiar words are found to embody definite compounds, which may be resolved into simpler ideas.

The literature of the Sanscrit is remarkable for its copiousness and its antiquity. Of about twelve thousand works now known to exist, few are less than two thousand years old, and many are very much older. The remote source from which all this literature takes its rise is the Veda. "Veda" means knowledge. But to understand this term we must again refer to the origin of the Aryan race. From the Central Asian home nearly all the kindred tribes pushed, as with an instinctive impulse, to the northwest. Passing the gates of the Caucasus into Europe, they became energetic and practical nations. For twenty-five centuries they have been the foremost actors in the history of the world. They have perfected

art, have subdued nature, and have spread their influence and policy over most of the globe. To Europe we must look for the dramatic and historic glory of the Aryan men. The Hindoo, after all his brethren had departed westward, made his way slowly, as if against some natural law, to the south and east, crossing the Himalayas, and finding his home along the valleys of the Indian rivers. In this rich, self-satisfying land, shut by natural barriers, he was secluded from the rest of the world. Strabo remarks that no great conqueror from the west but the fabled Bacchus, and Hercules, and, later, Alexander, ever assailed India, nor did an Indian army ever invade another land. The result of this quiet seclusion, which, though interrupted, was not destroyed by certain internal struggles, (the chief of which, celebrated in the Maha-bharata, that is, Magnum Indicum s. c. Bellum, resulted in the overthrow of the warrior race,) was that the Hindoo mind, uninterested in enterprises of war and commerce, in art and politics, turned to contemplation within itself. Here it toiled with a quiet industry like the coral in the Indian seas. Its highest effort was the grasping of the idea of an eternal self. Its highest religious flight was to realize the bond which connected the personal self (atman) with this Eternal Self, (Paramatman.) This bond is obscured by material creation and this world's affairs, as the sun is obscured by mists and vapors, which, however, are unsubstantial and delusive. Our present life is a "pretyahava," a birth after a previous death, a death by separation from the self-existent, to which that we call death is a restoration. Therefore the wisest temper in this life was a yearning after death. The Hindoo, directly the opposite of his Greek kinsman, turned away from the useful and the beautiful, from outward activities and interests, and contemplated an eternity of thought and rest. He was the most perfect man, who was most abstracted from practical affairs, and in retirement gave himself to calm meditation. A Brahman once traveled westward as far as Athens. He found men with whom nature and the affairs of the present life were everything. Perplexed, perhaps disgusted, at the gay and busy dash of the atheistic world around him, he resolved to give a lesson of a better way. He burned himself on his own funeral pile at Athens, and the Greeks, astonished rather than instructed, inscribed

upon the tomb of the lone traveler, that he had sought immortality after the old custom of the Indians. Such were the Hindoos as found by Alexander: a nation of philosophers, whose inward life had absorbed all their practical faculties, and who, devoted to religious and metaphysical ideas, were neither able nor desirous to obtain a place in history.

The germ of this temper of mind is found in the Veda—that body of sacred poetry embodying doctrines, hymns, and rules of sacrifice, whose origin is previous to all history. The legend of the Veda is this: Brahman, the self-existing element, burns with a desire to create, and, from the heat, sweat exudes at the pores of his or its body. He sees in this water his own shadow, falls in love with it, and produces Atharvan, lord of creation. This one produces twenty classes of poets, whose poems are the Atharvana Veda. Brahman then creates three gods: Agni, (fire,) for the earth; Vayu, (wind,) for the sky; and Aditya, (sun,) for the heavens. From Agni then comes the Rig-Veda; from Vayu the Yagur-Veda; and from Aditya the Sama-Veda. The Vedas came from the Rishis, to whom they were first delivered, to ten Mandalas, or select families, for preservation and transmission. The first Veda is for the general use of all Brahmans—the descendants of the Rishis; the others are for the use of the three orders of priests.

Some of these Vedic hymns are really beautiful, and seem to present the thoughts of a simple, pious people. One, addressed to Varuna, (*ὀυρανός*,) "Lord of all, of heaven and earth," is a litany whose strains of penitent thought and faith we cannot despise.

"However we break thy laws from day to day, men as we are, O god Varuna, do not deliver us unto death, nor to the blow of the furious, nor to the anger of the spiteful." "If I go along trembling, like a cloud driven by the wind, have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright god, I have gone to the wrong shore: have mercy, Almighty, have mercy. Whenever, O Varuna, we men commit an offense before the heavenly host; whenever we break thy law through thoughtlessness, have mercy, Almighty, have mercy."

These expressions, taken from a large number of similar ones, show the presence of moral truths in the Vedic hymns. Here we see a belief in God, a perception of the difference between good and evil, a conviction of divine hatred toward

sin, and that there is some element of guilt even in our infirmities; also, that while moral laws are eternal, "He is merciful even to him who hath committed sin." There is a manifest propensity to worship fire. The glow of the rising sun, and the bursting of flame out of darkness, were always impressive upon the Aryan mind. Agni, god of fire, is called messenger from earth to heaven. "Thy appearance is fair to behold, thou bright-faced Agni, when like gold thou shinest at hand; thy brightness comes like the lightning of heaven; thou showest splendor like the bright sun."

Although many gods are named in the Veda, yet each is always addressed as possessing the attributes of all; as if he were, in fact, the only Divine Being. "They call him Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni." "That which is One, the wise call in many ways." It would seem that while the attributes of God had become reckoned as gods, the idea of One in whom all inhered had not yet died away. In process of time the phenomena of nature assume, as in Greece, the character of divine beings. Thus "Ushas," the Dawn, daughter of "Dyaus," the Sky, corresponds to the classic Aurora. A hymn is found, in which some man, who in the far ages watched the ever glorious rising of the morn, speaks out the awe and gladness of his heart in language like that used by many a poet since: "She brought light by striking down darkness." "She rose up, spreading far and wide, and moving toward every one. She grew in brightness, wearing her brilliant garment. The mother of the morning clouds, (lit. *cows*,) the leader of the days, she shone forth, gold-colored, lovely to behold." These simple thoughts, uttered in great variety of rhythm, with every word expressive, are very charming.

The Vedic cosmogony is impressive. A hymn, of which there are two metrical versions in English, is wonderfully bold and sublime. It refers to an epoch previous to all existence. "Nothing that is, was then." "Even what is not, did not then exist." Being had neither positive nor negative side. "What was it that covered what?" A Grecism! What was the covering, and what the covered? "Was water the chaos that swallowed all? There was no death, therefore there was nothing deathless." Can a negative exist without a positive? "There was no space, no life, no time, no solar torch by

which morning might have been told from evening." "That One (the Self-existent) breathed breathless by itself. It enjoyed more than mere existence, yet its life was not dependent on anything else, as our life is dependent on the air we breathe. It breathed breathless." "Darkness there was as of ocean without light." Here "by the shore of the Absolute, which has no shore," breathing and heaving within itself, without a star, creation begins. "Then first came love upon it, the bond between things created and uncreated. A ray of light enters. Who, indeed, knows? The gods were later than its forming, therefore who knows whence it came? The All-beholder in the heavens? or not even He?" This is a poem most striking in conception, in logic, and in language.

These specimens illustrate the best style of thought in the Vedas. Our authorities agree that they must have been composed earlier than B. C. 1200. The Brahmans claim that they have no human author, and they feel the deepest pain at the inquiries of European scholars into their dates and authorship. They call them "Sriti," "Revealed," and all other writings "Smriti," "Recollected." The Vedic hymns existed many centuries before any trace of the art of writing appears among the Hindoos. They were, like the Homeric poems, kept in memory by constant recitation, and thus comes to our view an important element in Hindoo society. The Brahmans appear from the first as an intellectual and highly cultivated class among the Aryans. They were the reputed descendants of those Rishis to whom the Veda was given, and they hold their position by a conceded divine appointment until this day. During the Vedic period, under the title of "puropitas," they had a controlling influence over matters not merely of religion and philosophy, but of war and government. When the Vedic stream ceased to flow, they set themselves carefully to gather into Sanhitas, or collections, the wealth of the productive ages. These Sanhitas are the classified Vedas, as distinct from the *Veda* in its broadest sense. After this was a period of general comment and exposition. These comments and explanatory essays, being for the use of the Brahmans, are called Brahmanas.

We now arrive at an interesting period in the history of an intellectual people. It is the period of the art preservative of arts, when, production having ceased, literature became an

objective art, like the period of Masora in Hebrew literature, or the Alexandrine in Greek. Rules are formed, grammar and rhetoric appear, and the labor of Aristarchus and Longinus begins. This, in Sanscrit literature, is called the period of Sutras or rules. The writings regarded unquestionably divine now cease, and the Sutras are of confessedly human origin, yet they rest upon the Veda as a basis. A native writer says that what is recollected implies something previously known, and *that* came by revelation. From this relation of the two departments of Sanscrit literature, the revealed and the recollected, arises the Brahminical idea of heresy. The authority of the Veda must be admitted. On this point orthodoxy allows no evasion or hesitation; but this is a matter of acknowledgment of authority, not at all of agreement in interpretation.

There are six schools or systems, differing on points of vital importance, yet all reputed orthodox because admitting the authority of the Veda. No matter how wild a doctrine may be, if by any straining or twisting it can be brought into harmony with any sense of any text of the Veda, "imprimatur," it is orthodox. Heresy thus consists only in denying the doctrine of the Veda. But if any Vedic teaching is perfectly intelligible, it is the supremacy of the Brahmans. Their outranking of the Warrior or Princely caste—the Kshatrya—dates from the pre-historic periods. In the earliest times, far before written records, the Brahman walked before the king, and accounted himself superior to him. Many verses of the Veda set forth the wisdom and prosperity of the civil ruler who obeys the Brahman. Certainly there is in the annals of mankind no other instance of a class of men maintaining for more than three thousand years an almost uninterrupted supremacy over their countrymen. Thus the Brahmanic authority becomes the practical test of heresy. No matter what one denies, so long as he acknowledges *that*. No matter what he acknowledges so long as he denies *that*. The celebrated heresy of Buddha is a complete illustration of this matter. He—his full title is Buddha Sakya Muni—lived about 500 B. C. He was a Kshatri, one of the nobility of the land. Though he entered the Brahmanic caste, he uttered no doctrine but such as may be found in other commentators, yet

he opposed with all his might the assumptions of the Brahmans. His followers say that he acknowledged the Veda as first given to the Rishis, but denied the Brahmanic comments. He certainly invaded the territory of the Brahmanic caste, and opposed their exclusive privileges. In so doing, he was declared to have attacked the divine authority on which they rested, and was pronounced a heretic.

How uniform is the hierarchical temper in all ages and in all systems! The Brahman, the Pharisee, and the Pope, are tolerant or intolerant upon the same ground, the confession or denial of *authority*. That covers all other points. Buddhists and Brahmanists stand to each other in much the same relation in which the early Protestants stood to the Romanists, alike in so many things as to be peculiarly bitter in their actual differences. The effect of Buddha's teaching could have been produced only in an age of mental elasticity, near to the golden age of the Indian mind. Though addressed only to those classes who suffered most from Brahmanical pretensions, yet the intellectual freedom which it announced was welcome to many, and the result was after a while the complete temporary overthrow of Brahmanism. In breaking up the tyranny of an exclusive system, and giving a larger freedom of ideas to an extensive and cultivated society, Buddhism had a moral value, and may be regarded as a step toward Christianity. In following times a reaction took place. Brahmanism recovered its footing, Buddhism was driven out, and to-day it has on Indian soil not one devotee; yet it is the most prevalent religion in the world. In Eastern Asia, more than three hundred millions of people, some of the lowest of our race in morals, hold it the true system of faith and worship. Intrenched as it is, only Christianity can contend with it. The conflict begun by Dr. Judson in Burmah is continued at many points, not to be abandoned until the nations under its influence, as under the shadow of death, shall be fully brought to a better light and life.

The period in which Buddhism was developed is, as we have already stated, that of Sutras, "Strings," "Lines of Doctrine," composed for the preservation and transmission of the Veda. The traditional text of the Veda is called Sakha, a word also used to mean what we would call partial editions of the same

text. The Vedic labor is closely subdivided. The men devoted to the oral recitation of the Sakha, are called Charana. The various Charanas collected into a Brahmanic community, form a Parishad. Thus a Parishad resembles a European University, in which the Veda should be the grand study, the Charanas the separate faculties or departments, and the Sakhas the specific authorities or text-books. A complete Parishad consists of twenty-one Brahmans; but three or four in a village, devoted to law, philosophy, theology, and keeping the fire of sacrifice, may form a Parishad.

The learning and preservation of the Veda being thus provided for, the work itself was divided into six elements, upon which its significance depends. These, called Vedangas, or members of the Veda, are, pronunciation, meter, grammar, etymology, astronomy, and the ceremonial. To most minds the Sutra system is interesting as a device for the preservation of literary works, perhaps previously to the art of writing, most certainly independently of it. The Homeric poems, brief, compared with the Vedic, vital and glowing with thoughts warmly sympathetic with those of the minds to which they were committed, were orally preserved for about three hundred years. The Vedic have been kept for two thousand years, and at this day, with all facilities for printing, the Brahman clings to his oral recitations to preserve his sacred inheritance. This is good evidence not only of industry, as we shall see, but of a wise and natural division of labor.

The Sutras of pronunciation suggest, that at a very early day the Pracrit or spoken dialect began to differ from the sacred language. The euphonic laws of the Sanscrit are very copious, showing great delicacy of ear; and to have transmitted the euphonies of the language unimpaired for so many generations must have required the most careful attention.

The Sutras of meter illustrate the importance attached to the poetic form of the Veda. The earliest and most easily preserved monuments of literature are usually poetical. The meters of the Veda present very great variety and intricacy. The Sutras of grammar and etymology would both be included in our term grammar. For practical purposes the treatises of the native grammarians are cumbrous and fanciful. A

Brahman of to-day might learn his sacred tongue from the grammar of Prof. Williams, or of several who can be named, far better than from any method of his own countrymen. Yet it is to be remarked, that just before Aristotle developed in the Greek those ideas of general grammar on which we base the modern science, and to which we even owe its terms, from which, too, the systems of Arabian and Jewish grammarians were manifestly taken, the Hindoos had of themselves developed a grammatical science. The Greeks seized language as something objective, and treated it with philosophical accuracy, and hence the grasp of their system is sufficient and practicable for all languages, but they were slow in recognizing linguistic facts; only as late as Aristarchus do we find six parts of speech acknowledged. But with the Hindoos, fond of subjective contemplation, language, which indeed seems to contain in itself the germ of all sciences, early became a matter of wonder and meditation. The Goddess of Speech is in the Veda far more important and powerful than the Muses invoked by Homer. The songs of the Rishis contained truths on which all human welfare for all ages depended. It was therefore natural that the highest attention be paid to the vehicle by which those truths were conveyed. So thought was early turned, not only toward accuracy of pronunciation, but to the nature of language, and the organization of its elements. The earliest authors give full recognition to the facts of speech. The distinctions of nouns, verbs, prepositions, and particles, of numbers and cases, are quite scientifically stated. Katyayani, who wrote before the time of Plato, discusses nouns, verbs, derivatives, and compounds, more copiously and satisfactorily than the Cratylus. An extensive and curious discussion between two large schools, as to whether all nouns were derived from verbs, is ably rehearsed by Yaska, who decides that no general law can be proved, but that the derivation of each word is simply a matter of fact and history. There comparative philology is, even at this day, compelled to leave the question.

The fifth Vedanga is devoted to the rules concerning sacrifice. Its Sutras are the most complete and copious of all, being daily of practical value in the Brahmanic ritual. It has little to interest the general reader.

From the Sutras of the sixth Vedanga, we learn that a Sacred Calendar was early established, the moon being, as in most other countries, the measuring luminary. The intercalary month was recognized. The astronomical tables, to which the attention of the learned was called by Bailly, the value of which was perhaps overestimated, are no part of this Vedanga.

The sentences in these Sutras are brief and abrupt, "closely twisted like a rope," like those of an algebraic formula. They give only the skeletons of the elements above indicated, and all these depend for their explanation upon the commentaries. They need elucidation to the learner as much as the multiplication table to the tyro in arithmetic. Commentaries abound, and commentaries upon commentaries.

All these the Brahmans learn by heart, and invariably from oral recitation. The process of learning is extended over most of a lifetime. A Brahman seldom presumes to attempt more than one subject. He spends day after day and year after year under the guidance of his Guru, or teacher, learning a little daily, and constantly repeating, as a part of his daily devotions, from his former lessons, until he becomes in his turn a teacher. He is allowed to learn from the mouth of his Guru, and is cursed if he learn from written copies. "Those who write the Vedas, they shall go to hell," says the Mahabharata. Kumarila, a great authority, declares the knowledge of the truth worthless if it has been obtained from writing. Every Brahman learns for twelve years from the lips of his teacher. If he does not wish to marry, this time is lengthened to forty-eight years, all spent in hearing and rehearsing the ancient Vedic literature and its commentaries. How important in their view must be that to which such toil is given! and how vast the capacity of the human memory when put to its severest efforts! This known fact makes clear what is noticed by the Greek writers. Megasthenes says that the Indians had no written laws, but administered justice from memory. Nearchus tells us that the laws of the Indians were not put in writing. Yet they used letters for roadside inscriptions. This non-use of writing for literary purposes seems to have perplexed the Greeks, who, as far as they knew the Indians, certainly respected them as an intellectual people.

We have, in thus giving an outline of the Veda and the literature developed from it, indicated all that is of value in the Sanscrit language. Before the Christian era—the usual date of the Sakuntala—the fountain had ceased to flow. The Sanscrit ceased to be a living tongue, and was known only by its gigantic and well-preserved remains. To trace in later times the feebler workings of the Hindoo mind, after the old faith and its inspirings were lost in stupidities and depravities, is beyond the design of this paper.

We have spoken of the exclusive and aboriginal development of the Hindoo mind. It is possible that at one time it came in contact with Jewish civilization, and that at a very interesting epoch. The point of destination of Solomon's fleets, the rich and distant Ophir, has been a matter of perpetual conjecture. The words employed in Hebrew to designate two characteristic objects of import, "apes and peacocks," are of foreign, and apparently of Sanscrit, origin. At that time the intellect of India was in the rare state of development when a large and susceptible mind, like that of the Jewish king, would most readily receive impressions from it. The golden age of Israel seems to coincide with the golden age of Vedic thought. We know, too, that Solomon alone, of the Jewish kings, appreciated foreign civilization and invited foreign influences. We can thus far say, that the transfer of some intellectual impression along the track of commerce to the cosmopolitan mind of Solomon, is at least possible. If, now, we look still further, we find ascribed to Solomon two works whose tone and character stand in marked distinctness from all other Hebrew writings. We refer to Ecclesiastes and Canticles. The one, that profound and comprehensive essay in which the problem of human life is contemplated from every side, and its elements of sadness, delusion, and evanescence so vividly portrayed, must have been written on the soil of Palestine, perhaps not by Solomon. Yet it has a wonderfully Brahmanic tone, as if its key-note had been given by those Indian sages, who, above all others, were wont to turn from the frail and fading present to "rest and expatiate in a life to come."

The Canticles, that drama in which the virtuous steadiness of devoted love is so tenderly represented, shows still more of the non-Jewish, still more of the tone afterward exhibited in

the Sakuntala. We dismiss this discussion, perhaps to resume it elsewhere, with the remark that it is quite probable that we here find a positive, though unconscious, influence from India over the Jewish mind.

The introduction of the Sanscrit as a study into the institutions of this country is a question of practical interest. Our students must now learn it abroad; at least we know of but one American professorship of the language. Our collegiate courses are crowded, and our collegiate Faculties are continually perplexed to get into the curriculum some fair representation of the various branches of knowledge upon which the intellectual activity of our day is employed. Yet it is true of studies, as Webster once said of the legal profession, "There is always room enough in the upper story." If a new candidate can show sufficient claim, it should be admitted, whatever may be the competition. We believe that the Sanscrit should be introduced into some one of our Methodist colleges as a post-graduate study, or into some one of our theological schools. We would urge this, not for the sake of any literary treasures which it is known to contain, but solely for its linguistic and philological value.

The first class of persons who would profit by a course of instruction in Sanscrit, is composed of professional teachers of the classics. With these the writer is in sympathy. "*Et ego pictor.*" In spite of some small-voiced utilitarianism, we are a numerous class. Nearly five hundred are teaching Latin and Greek in schools under Methodist patronage. They have little popular sympathy, and little opportunity for fame or fortune. They must find their chief solace and satisfaction in their work, and no satisfaction is ampler than that from a conscious mastery over our subject-matter. A habit of referring Greek and Latin words to their older home in the roots of the Sanscrit, and of tracing the terminations to that vigorous and elastic tongue in which all are significant, makes the routine of the recitation room instructive and entertaining to the instructor. He finds himself lifted from the dullness of the drill, which long ago lost its novelty, "from these low grounds where sorrows dwell," to a lively, edifying, self-sustaining exercise, by which his own mind is continually expanded and illuminated. The slow melting of the high Sanscrit glacier keeps the

Greek and Latin on the lower slope constantly fresh and verdant.

So numerous are our teachers of classics, and so much is their work tending to become a profession for a life, that it may be expected that the college which shall first have facilities for acquiring the Sanscrit, will draw to itself a respectable number of graduates who will be desirous of a thorough professional preparation. The founding of a Sanscrit chair in any of our colleges, now so clearly desirable, not to say necessary, is worthy the attention of any large-minded patron who would give an impulse and a dignity to the cause of classical learning in our Methodist literary institutions. His name would be associated with a noble effort to put our classical and philological studies on a level with those of Europe.

The other class whom the establishment of a Sanscrit course in some of our theological schools might benefit, is composed of those who intend to become missionaries in India. The number of such may be expected to increase in subsequent years. As we have said, the Sanscrit is better understood, certainly better taught, in Berlin, Oxford, and Hertford, than in India. At this latter place it is learned by those who enter the Indian civil service. The Sanscrit, though not now spoken, is the basis of all the actual native tongues. He who has attained it may be said to have learned half of almost every vernacular in India; while he who is ignorant of it can never possess a perfect and critical understanding of any, though he may acquire a practical use of them. All abstract ideas are given in the Indian tongues by Sanscrit terms, and scarcely a sentence can be expressed with beauty and energy without its aid. It gives the foreigner a powerful prestige upon the native mind, if he can read and quote the Veda in its pure original language. The only question can be, whether a Sanscrit basis can be better laid in the training of a missionary here or upon the Indian soil. The example of the East India Company, in training its cadets at Hertford, is in favor of having Sanscrit taught at home. So practical a question admits of an early decision. It would surely give a look of broad and noble purpose to any of our theological schools, if it could be furnished with facilities for expounding that language, held sacred as the vehicle of faith and revelation by religions whose votaries

are more numerous, and whose rites and formulas are more ancient than those of any other upon earth, with which Christianity is to have its sternest, grandest pre-millennial battle.

The study of Sanscrit is difficult, but facilities for it are rapidly increasing. The best grammar for an English student is probably that of Prof. Williams, of Hertford; but Max Muller, Professor at Oxford, who is second to none as a Sanscrit scholar, is about to publish an Elementary Grammar and Chrestomathy, by which it is expected that the initial obstacles will be greatly reduced.

Art. III.—THE GREEK CHURCH IN ITS RELATION TO THE PROTESTANT.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

In the arrangement of doctrines the early Christian Church pursued the logical order, placing first in the system the doctrine concerning God, or Theology. To this she was pressed by an external, as well as an internal (or philosophic) necessity. This accomplished, she turned her attention, with more or less vigor, to the doctrine concerning Man, or Anthropology. On the subject of anthropology in the first, second, and third centuries we shall find a greater degree of unanimity, greater clearness of statement, and evidences of more profound investigation than are generally accorded to the Fathers.

In this investigation the first question properly relates to the soul: Whence is it?

This question received three answers, only two of which gained much support. 1. The soul is pre-existent, and from its pre-existent state is brought into union with the body. 2. The soul is propagated with the body. 3. The soul is created and immediately united with the body.

These were severally styled the theory of pre-existence, of traduction, and of creation. The first theory was held by Origen of Alexandria, and by Numentius and Prudentius, and recently revived by the author of "The Conflict of Ages;" but was then, as it is now, almost universally discarded.

The second theory was first distinctly stated by Tertullian,

and afterward accepted by Gregory the Great, and Augustine, and Luther, and Edwards, and Samuel Hopkins.

Gerhard says, (Hagenbach, ii, § 116,) "Animas eorum, qui ex Adamo et era progeniti fuissent, non creatas, neque etiam generatas, sed propagatas fuisse." And Hollaz declares: "Anima humana hodie non immediate creatur, sed mediante semine fœcundo a parentibus generatur et in liberos tradicitur." Again he says, The human soul is propagated by traduction.

The third theory, that the body, not the soul, is propagated from Adam, while a new soul is created at every human birth, was held by the Greek Fathers generally, by Jerome and Leo the Great, by Hilary of Pictavium, by the schoolmen of the Middle Ages, by Calvin, Beza, Bellarmine, Peter Martyr, etc., etc.

Indeed Augustine himself would not object to Creationism, if the problem of sin could be solved by it consistently with his opinion of the transmission of Adam's sin. This, Augustine held, logically involves (as Tertullian had perceived before him) the transmission of the sinning soul. (Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine, ii, 16.)

The Council of Constance, 540 A. D., ordained: Ἡ ἐκκλησια τοῖς θειοις ἑπομέν λόγοις φάσκεί τήν ψυχὴν συνδημιουργηθῆναι τῳ σώματι· καὶ οὐ τό μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὕστέρον, κατὰ τὴν Ὠριγένους φρενοβλαβειαν. (See Mansi, ix, p. 396.) Beza rejects Traducianism in these emphatic words: Doctrina de animæ traduce mihi per absurda videtur. Jerome declares Creationism the orthodox doctrine, (Epist. ad Pammachium, 397;) and Leo the Great styles it the doctrine of the Church. (Ep. 15, ad Turrib.) "Speaking generally, the theory of Creationism was the dominant one in the Eastern Church, and found advocates in the Western." (Shedd, ii, p. 11.) "The Scriptures," says Augustine, "give no decisive settlement of the question at issue between Creationism and Traducianism. Admitting original sin as guilt, we may deduce Traducianism after the manner of Gregory the Great; or, holding the doctrine of Traducianism, we may deduce the doctrine of original sin and guilt.

The next important inquiry is, What is the moral condition of the individual at birth?

The Traducianist will not be troubled in harmonizing his

theory with the doctrine of original sin, as guilt. It logically involves it, as we have just seen. But we confine ourselves now to the answer given by the advocates of Creationism, as this is, though not with perfect unanimity, the theory of the Greek Fathers. Platon in his "Orthodox Instruction," quoted by Masson, p. 44, says, "Man spiritually dead, receives through the operations of grace, spiritual life. For this reason, the Spirit, as the bestower of grace, is called the Lord and Giver of Life." According to the author of "A History of Christian Doctrine," ii, 19, "The soul as newly created (and it is newly created in every individual instance according to the creationist) cannot be anything but a pure and perfect soul. It cannot be tainted with evil of any kind." The advocates of both theories agree in locating sin in the soul, hence we should not expect Creationists to admit the doctrine of original sin as guilt. At the same time it is proper to remark that the theory of Pelagius, which rejected the doctrine of original sin in any definition of it, was condemned by the Eastern as well as by the Western Church.

The Fathers of the Alexandrine School—the two Gregories, the two Cyrils, Athanasius and Basil—admitted universal corruption inherited from Adam, which they called original sin, but which they did not consider culpable, imposing upon infants a universal tendency to actual sin, but not imparting guilt. With this coincided the doctrine of the School of Antioch—Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theodore of Mopsuestia—that the human race by their physical descent from Adam had inherited, not sin as guilt, but corruption, evil which carried with it a universal tendency to sin. Chrysostom would allow that corruption and mortality are transmissible from parent to child, from Adam to the race, but that sin and guilt are not thus transmissible. This became the general doctrine of the Eastern Church. Indeed, up to the opening of the fifth century, the Church, both East and West, generally held the doctrine of an inherited corruption as distinguished from an inherited guilt. (Shedd, ii, 39.) According to the same authority, this general type of doctrine, under new forms and names, has perpetuated itself in the Eastern Church down to the present time. In the light of these statements and definitions we perceive the import of the Longer (Russian) Catechism

in reply to the question, "Why did not the first man, only, die, and not all, as now?" Answer: "Because all have come of Adam since his infection by sin, and all sin in themselves." As from an infected source there naturally flows an infected stream, so from a father infected with sin, and consequently mortal, there naturally proceeds a posterity infected like him with sin, and like him mortal." Creationism does not allow that the soul is propagated from Adam, but is newly created. But all else, as it is propagated, or flows from this infected stream, is itself infected and corrupt. There is, in the language of the Greek Fathers, original sin, but not guilt; inherited corruption, but not culpability. As Chrysostom taught, corrupt mortal Adam begets corrupt mortal offspring. "How is this spoken of in the Holy Scriptures?" the Longer Catechism inquires. The answer is (Rom. v, 12): "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." And so, precisely, answers Chrysostom with this explanation: "No one owes anything to justice until he first becomes a sinner for himself. What then is the meaning of the word ἁμαρτολοὶ, in the phrase 'were made sinners?' It seems to me to denote liability to suffering and death." This explanation of Chrysostom is perfectly consistent with his theory of Creationism, which does not allow that the voluntary part, the human soul, is derived from Adam. But as there was not among the early Greek Fathers complete unanimity in this view and its logical consequences, (for example, Gregory of Nyssa advocated Traducianism,) so there is some diversity among the modern Greek Christians: Philaret, for example, speaks of "evil desires, or the first efforts of the will to sin, as a sin meriting God's wrath;" intimating, perhaps, the doctrine of original sin as guilt; while Platon and Stourdza have been said to lean toward Traducianism.

Of the three theories, then, that fallen Adam transmitted to his posterity, 1, inherited sin and guilt, 2, inherited corruption only, with a universal tendency to sin, 3, merely a bad example, the second is the general doctrine of the Greek Church. Greek theologians of a later period, like John Damascene of the eighth century, followed by Nicholas of Methone and others, admitted "a deterioration of the moral

power of man, but retained the earlier notions concerning human liberty."

John of Damascus taught that the effect of the fall brought man into a physical state of labor and trial, subjecting him to pain, dissolution, and death; and left him morally despoiled of divine grace, and deprived of confidence toward God: *γυμνωθεὶς της χάριτος καὶ την προς θεὸν παῤῥησίαν ἀπεκ δυσαμενος.*—De Fide Orthodoxa, Lib. iii, c. 1.

The Confession of Dositheus (1672 A. D.) Art. VI, declares: "We believe that the first man created by God fell, in paradise, . . . and thence flowed in succession original sin, so that no one is born according to the flesh who does not bear this burden, and does not feel its fruits [effects] in this life. But the fruits which we call sin, which take place by a wicked choice, are against the divine will and not of nature, for many, like John the Harbinger and the Virgin Mary, were not thus tempted." Again, "As no one can be saved without holy baptism, John iii, 5, it is essentially necessary also for infants, because they also are subject to original sin."

We are now prepared to advance one step farther, and inquire: What is the theory of the Greek Church in regard to the human will since the Fall? This question does not relate to the primeval condition of the will, for all admit, even Augustine, that anterior to the Fall the human will was free toward good and evil. The Longer Catechism asserts: God of his goodness at the creation of man gave him a will naturally disposed to love God, but still free; and man used this freedom for evil. The Council of Bethlehem, (1672 A. D.,) in the fourteenth article of the Ultimatum sent to the English bishops, speaking of man since the Fall, explicitly declares, "that he has the same nature in which he was created, and the energy of that nature, which is free will living and acting, so that by nature he can choose and do good, and avoid and hate evil. . . . In the third article, from which we have already quoted, in regard to predestination or fore-ordination, founded on foreknowledge, the freedom of the will is distinctly recognized, and the using of that free will well or ill is designated as the ground of the divine approval or condemnation. Proceeding to explain the use of the free will, it speaks of inceptive grace bestowed upon all, but "which does not benefit those not

willing to obey it, but those willing." Whereas, "those who are not willing to obey . . . but who abuse the free will which they received from God for the purpose of willingly performing what was good, are given up to everlasting condemnation." Again, whatever God does for us "does not take away the act of willing or not willing to obey." Much more of like import might be quoted from the same article. Some passages in the Longer Catechism seem to clash with this statement of the Greek patriarchs; for example, "Man cannot really do good works, unless he receive, through faith in Jesus Christ, spiritual strength." But the general doctrine is that this gift is conditioned upon the acceptance or rejection of the free will.

Again, on "The Duty of Parish Priests," speaking of the petition, "Thy will be done," it is said we are directed to ask our heavenly Father that he would put into our hearts the desire and the power to do his will. But by the general doctrine this gift again is conditioned upon our willingness to receive it. There is really no collision. The existence of a free will is quite different from the question whether a free will surrounded by corruption and mortality can, unaided, do all that God desires of us. Keeping the two distinct, and ascertaining the theory of the Greek theologians in regard to the former, we shall be prepared for their solution of the latter. There are apparent exceptions to the theory of a free will. Michael, Metropolitan of St. Petersburgh and Novogorod, in his sermon on Eph. ii, 8, 9, says that "a carnal man not only cannot do what is good, he cannot even will it." And Philaret, the Metropolitan of Moscow, asserts that man in his natural, corrupt state has liberty in choice of natural, civil, and moral good; but for spiritual and saving operations he has no free will and power. However, he appends this remark, that the law is designed to reveal to man his weakness, that he may unconditionally give himself up to grace; implying that all turns finally upon the decisive act of the free will. But all these statements may be readily harmonized with the Greek theory of the existence of a free will, which yet needs the inceptive grace of God to withstand the surrounding influences of corruption, the artifices of Satan, and the allurements of the world, and which is free in accepting or rejecting this grace.

This theory accords with the view of Chrysostom, already

referred to, that the will is an attribute of the soul which is not derived from Adam, but directly from God himself, and therefore is not vitiated or deprived of its freedom by the sin of Adam.

Hagenbach, i, § 108, states that "the doctrine of the freedom of the will was distinctly maintained by the Greek Church," and cites especially Gregory of Nazianzum, (to whom Augustine appealed in preference to all others,) Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim the Syrian, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom, who insisted, most of all, upon the liberty of man, and his moral self-determination, and these are especial authorities in the Greek Church at the present day. In the second and third centuries both the Eastern and the Western Churches were strongly emphatic in asserting the doctrine of human freedom, (Shedd, ii, b. iv, c. ii.) And says Justin Martyr, "Unless we suppose that man has it in his power to choose the good and refuse the evil, no one can be accountable for any action whatever." I might quote from Clement and Origen, from Theophilus and Irenæus, in illustration of this same view of free will. The same doctrine was reasserted by John of Damascus in the eighth century, as well as by the other Greek theologians down to Nicholas of Methone, (see Ullman, l. c, p. 86.) On this doctrine there is indeed a general agreement among the earlier and later fathers of the Greek Church, (Hag., i, 157.) Says Clement of Alexandria: "Man, like every other spiritual being, can never lose the power of arbitrary (free, unnecessitated) choice." So Origen teaches that "the human will sustains a like relation to moral good and moral evil;" that is, the will in itself is free toward one or the other. At the same time this consists readily with the fact of vicious surroundings which allure and entice to sin, the will acting freely and responsibly.

What now is the doctrine of the Greek Church in regard to the work of regeneration? Is it monergistic or synergistic, effected by a co-operative, or by a single agency?

Even those Greek Fathers who insisted most strongly upon human freedom, like Clement of Alexandria, strictly inculcated the necessity of gracious assistance in the work of regeneration: God co-operates with those souls that are willing. As the physician furnishes health to that body which synergizes toward health, (by a recuperative energy of its own,) so God

furnishes eternal salvation to those who synergize toward the knowledge and obedience of the truth." Herein Clement unquestionably teaches that this work is effected only as man turns receptively toward the proffered aid. The agency implied is clearly synergistic. John i, 12, and similar passages, are cited as illustrative of this view: "As many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God." This is no less definitely stated by Justin Martyr, (Apol., i, 10:) "God only persuades and draws us gently in our regeneration by co-operating freely with those rational powers which he has bestowed upon us." And Origen taught that the human will is the ultimate efficient, and accordingly receives the divine approval or condemnation. Hence the divine appeal: "Whosoever will, let him come. I called, and ye refused. I would have gathered you . . . but ye would not," etc. The statement of Chrysostom accords with this view: "If man, upon his side, works toward holiness, God's grace will come in to succor and strengthen him." Commenting on the passage, Rom. x, 16, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," Chrysostom says this indicates that the whole power is not of man. Assisting grace is needed from above.

But these citations of the Greek Fathers may be summed up in one general statement by one whose testimony in this direction is unquestionably impartial: "Until the opening of the fifth century the Church, both east and west, not only held the doctrine of an inherited corruption as distinguished from an inherited guilt, but also held the doctrine of synergistic regeneration." (Shedd, ii, 197.)

Afterward, as is well known, the monergism of Augustine prevailed in the west, till in the middle ages it was in turn superseded by Semi-Pelagianism, which taught, like Eastern Orthodoxy, inherited corruption and Synergistic Regeneration. Since the Reformation the Greek and Latin theories may be recognized under the modern Protestant names, but with historic identity.

The later position of the Greek Church on this position is stated fully and clearly by the Synod of Bethlehem, A. D. 1672, which statement was republished by the Synod of Russia in 1838 A. D.

Article III declares, "We understand the use of the free will thus: 'That divine and enlightening grace, which also we call inceptive, by the divine goodness affords light to all in darkness who are disposed to obey it . . . but those who are not willing to obey and consent to this grace, and who for this reason do not do what God wishes us to perform, and by the artifices of Satan abuse the free will which they received from God for the purpose of willingly performing what was good, are given up to everlasting condemnation."

"God alone is the cause of salvation according to the enlightening grace which he gives previous to the supposed works . . . but this does not take away the act of willing to obey him."

Here again the human will is regarded as the final efficient, acting freely and responsibly, and so receiving approbation if accepting, condemnation if rejecting. In this position the Greek patriarchs unquestionably agree with the Greek Fathers like Justin Martyr and Cyprian, who taught that the benefits of redemption are secured by the merits of the Divine Redeemer, but that they are to be appropriated by a free act of the human agent.

We pass now to consider the doctrine of Redemption as held by the Greek Church. This, in its various relations, is a question of vital importance in this discussion, and must evermore be regarded by Protestants with intense interest. To guide us we have some explicit declarations made by authority, and approved by modern synodical councils.

Article VIII of the Confession of the Patriarch Dositheus, approved by the Synod of Bethlehem, declares: "We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ became the only Mediator, and gave himself up as a ransom for all, to make by his own blood a reconciliation between God and man; and that he, having care of his own, [people,] is the advocate and the propitiation for our sins."

In reference to Christ's sufferings and death, the Shorter Russian Catechism declares: "We believe that he endured all this, [namely, sin and death,] not for himself, being wholly innocent and sinless, but for us; that is, he endured all the penalties due to all the sins of men, and death itself, in order to deliver us from sin and death."

The Longer Catechism, after asserting that Christ's sacrifice of himself was voluntary, and confirming it by reference to John x, 17, 18, affirms that by his death on the cross Christ delivered us from sin, the curse, and death, citing proofs from Scripture. Of deliverance from sin, Eph. i, 7; of deliverance from the curse, Gal. iii, 13; of deliverance from death, Heb. ii, 14, 15. Then, with discrimination, it answers the question, "How does the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross deliver us from sin, the curse, and death? Christ is the second Adam, the new Almighty Head of men, whom he unites to himself through faith. His voluntary suffering and death on the cross for us being of infinite value and merit as the death of one sinless, God and man in one person, is both a perfect satisfaction to the justice of God which hath condemned us to death for sin, and a fund of infinite merit, which has obtained him the right, without prejudice to justice, to give us sinners pardon of our sins, and grace to have victory over sin and death."

The authorities just quoted are explicit in teaching the universality of the atonement. The Confession of Dositheus, Article VIII, declares that our Lord Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all. The Longer Catechism proposes this question: "Was it for us all, strictly speaking, that Jesus Christ suffered?" and answers thus: "For his part he offered himself as a sacrifice strictly for all, and obtained for all grace and salvation; but this benefits only those of us who for their parts, of their own free will, have fellowship in his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death. Phil. iii, 10."

"The Duty of Parish Priests" directs them to teach that it is clearly shown in the Scriptures that God willeth not the death of the sinner, but is willing to save all, even every one, citing 1 Tim. ii, 4; Ezek. xxxiii, 11.

Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, and Professor of Divinity in the Spiritual Academy, states in his "Comparison of Doctrines," Art. XII: "The sufferings and death of Christ are an abundant satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Eph. v, 25–27." Upon this point, so far as I have observed, there is unanimity in the Greek Church.

That the atonement is the ground of salvation, and that faith is a means of justification, is distinctly taught; but upon the question, Whether faith in Christ is the only means of justifi-

cation, there is a variety of utterances. Yet this, among Protestants, is the recognized test of evangelicity. It was a principle with Luther to be tolerant toward ceremonies, but to insist upon this confession, that sin is pardoned on account of God's Son, and that man receives this blessing through faith. D'Aubigné asserts that the Church had fallen because the great doctrine of Justification by Faith had been lost. Whenever this fundamental truth shall be restored, all the errors and devices which have usurped its place will be banished.

The ultimatum of the Synod of Bethlehem, Art. IX, declares: "We believe that no one is saved without faith. By faith we mean the most correct opinion we have concerning God and divine things, which working by love, that is to say, by the divine commandments, justifies us before Christ; and without this it is impossible to please God." Art. XIII has been adduced as contradicting this: "We believe that man is not justified through faith alone, but through faith working by love, that is to say, by faith and works. . . . But we understand works not as witnesses, confirming our calling, but as fruits in themselves, through which faith becomes effectual, and being in themselves worthy by the divine promise," etc., etc.

The Longer Catechism, after declaring that the atonement can benefit only those who, of their own free will, have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Christ, inquires, "How can we have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ?" The reply is: "We have fellowship in the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ through a lively faith, through the sacraments in which is contained and sealed the virtue of his sufferings and death; and, lastly, through the crucifixion of our flesh with its affections and lusts." Gal. ii, 19, 20; Rom. vi, 3; 1 Cor. xi, 26; Gal. v, 24.

Here are two specific and important exceptions to the evangelical doctrine of Justification by Faith only, opening at once to all the excesses of sacramental efficacy and meritorious penance. Here sacraments and good works are placed on a level with faith in saving efficacy, for they, equally with faith, bring us into saving relations to Christ. This is radically different from the evangelical doctrine, that by true faith we have fellowship with our Lord Jesus Christ, and through his merits are

pardoned and justified, and henceforth, with the new life of faith, bring forth fruits unto righteousness, and the end everlasting life.

I pause here to give a single illustration of the legitimate and evil consequences to which this heretical theory leads, reserving the privilege of recurring to this point again. "The Duty of Parish Priests," Art. XIV, chap. 3, ordains that any person, by whose negligence a child dies unbaptized, is, by canon 68 of the Nomocanon, to be withheld from the communion for three years, and must do penance by two hundred prostrations daily, and fast the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday in every week. Art. XVIII directs that children baptized in infancy, upon growing up are to be taught, among other things, that in baptism "they received remission of their sins; that they put on the new man; that the white robe given them at their baptism signified the innocence with which they were then endued," etc.

Again the catechism inquires: "Is not faith alone enough for a Christian, without love and good works?" The reply is: "No; for faith without love and good works is inactive and dead, and so cannot lead to eternal life."

Yet it is proper to remark that we meet with occasional expressions of better promise in some works of partial authority, and from some individuals of apparently evangelical tendencies. Philaret, for example, in his "Comparison of Doctrines," Art. XIII, says: "Grace justifies through the power of the merits of Jesus Christ, which a man receives by living faith. Good works are the fruits of faith and grace, and therefore they do not constitute in man any kind of personal merit. Rom. iii, 23–28; Luke xvii, 10." A remark made upon this article by the author explains the declaration of the apostle James, "That by works is faith made perfect," thus: "The apostle shows justification in faith and works like the life in the root and fruit of the tree; so faith represents the root of justification. . . . The present difference of opinion between the Eastern and Western [that is, the Latin] Churches on this point refers more to the abstract principle than to active Christianity, because they are both agreed as to the obligation to good works; but those who find merit in their good works stand on pharisaical ground." A similar sentiment is found in

the Liturgy of St. Basil, (Neale, ii, 567,) in the prayer of the priests, "who are thought worthy by thee to serve at thy holy altar, not according to our righteousness, for we have done nothing good upon earth, but according to thy mercies," etc. And even "The Duty of Parish Priests" enjoins that they direct the penitent, who asks mercy of God, to have before his eyes Jesus Christ crucified, and trust only to his merits for the remission of sin; that they exhort the sick to cling with all his heart to Christ alone; that they present to the dying those texts which assure us that the sinner who repenteth is justified solely by God's grace, through lively and saving faith, and by none other thing whatever, citing Rom. iii, 24, 25; Ephes. ii, 8, 9; 1 John i, 7; Heb. x, 19; that they teach that lively and saving faith is essential to proper communion, and necessary in prayer; that confession without faith in Christ, which in the strictest and most proper sense means trust in Christ's merits, is no less dead than a body without a soul, for example, the confession of Judas. "How indeed," it asks, "should not faith be necessary to repentance when it has such virtue that of itself it brings peace to the troubled sinner, and frees him entirely from condemnation to torment? Rom. v, 1; viii, 1."

I might quote in this connection from the sermons of the eloquent Greek, Enconomus, the leader of the High Church party in Greece, delivered in Russia, 1833, and published in Berlin; or from those of the celebrated Russian, Procopovitch. But however interesting and encouraging may be the statements of individuals and inferior authorities, they are, to say the least, quite inconclusive.

Another article of faith relates to the Church. The Nicene Constantinopolitan Creed contains doctrines that are deemed essential by eastern orthodoxy. These are great spiritual truths, the objects not of sight, but of faith; they are therefore properly introduced by the phrase, I believe. The ninth article of this creed is stated thus: "I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

This indicates a spiritual conception of the true Church, of which Christ is the Head; which is sanctified by the same spiritual baptism, and united by saving faith to its divine Head, and thus holds real but invisible fellowship. It also suggests a careful and constant discrimination between the invisible

Church and the visible. This discrimination and this spirituality of conception are characteristic of the Protestant idea of the Church, manifest in German, Helvetic, Gallic, and Anglican confessions from Luther to Wesley. The Protestant distinction between the invisible and the visible Church is applied to the real and apparent here in time. The Greek, on the contrary, seems to disregard this distinction, and to assign to the invisible Church only those believers who have departed this life, and to the visible all those who remain. The Longer Catechism remarks on the ninth article: "We believe that the Church is invisible so far as she is partially in heaven, and contains all those who have departed hence in true faith and holiness."

This visible Church, then, is one. What is it, and who are its members? Art. IX of the Confession of Dositheus replies: "We believe that all the faithful, and only they, are members of the Catholic Church, that is to say, those who without doubting profess the unblemished faith of our Saviour Jesus Christ, (as shown by Christ himself and the apostles, and the Holy Œcumenical Councils,) although some of them may be guilty of manifold sins." While Art. X asserts: "We believe that the so-called, or rather which is the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in which we have been taught to believe, contains all the faithful in Christ who manifestly up to this time and now, being in their earthly pilgrimage, have not departed to their [heavenly] country."

We do not say that the orthodox Greek would formally assume that his is the only Christian Church, and condemn all others; but the theoretical probabilities are certainly threatening, and I know not that any practical proofs to the contrary have been furnished.

"How does it agree with the unity of the Church," asks the Longer Catechism on the ninth article, "that there are many separate and independent Churches, as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Russia?" Ans. "These are particular Churches or parts of the one Catholic Church. The unity is expressed outward by unity of creed, and by communion in prayer and sacraments." These are the sacraments, the liturgy, and the creed unquestionably of the orthodox Greek Church, so that the answer as well as the

question ignores any other Christian Church, and comports precisely with the most exclusive interpretation of the standards already quoted. But to proceed. What is the essential to Church organization? Art. X. of the Confession of Dositheus replies that the episcopal office is necessary to the Church, and without him [a bishop] no Church can exist, nor can any one be called or be a Christian. . . . We consider him as necessary to the Church as breath is to a man, and as the sun is to the world. . . . He rejects from the Church as heathen and publicans those who disobey, and subjects heretics to excommunication and a curse." Terms more significant of exclusiveness could not easily be found. The practice would need to be far more liberal than the creed to relieve the "Orthodox Church" of this charge. But to be more explicit still, the Longer Catechism inquires: "If the Catholic Church contains all true believers in the world, must we not acknowledge it to be necessary for salvation that every believer should belong to her?" The reply is: "Exactly so, since Jesus Christ, in the words of St. Paul, is the Head of the Church, and he is the Saviour of the body; it follows that to have part in his salvation we must necessarily be members of his body, that is, of the Catholic Church." According to this view, as has been aptly said by another in a somewhat similar connection, individuals come to Christ through the Church; while in the Protestant view they come to the Church through Christ." This suggests another vicious principle in this High Church theory, namely, the episcopal or priestly medium of grace, or, in relation to man, the episcopal control of grace. Says the Confession of Dositheus, Art. X: "He, the bishop, as a successor of the apostles . . . by the fullest energy of the consecrating spirit, is the source of all the mysteries of the Catholic Church, through which [mysteries] we obtain salvation."

Logically and directly related to this is the vicious notion of sacramental efficacy, as the same article declares: "Christ is joined to us through the sacred mysteries of which the bishop is the first author and consecrator through the Spirit." An illustration in point is furnished by the Longer Catechism: "The Apostle Peter writes that baptism saveth us after the figure of the ark of Noah. All who were saved from the general deluge were saved only in the ark, so all who obtain

everlasting salvation, obtain it only in the one Catholic Church."

This is taught in "The Duty of Parish Priests," where they are directed to instruct those baptized in childhood that they then received remission of their sins; while neglecting to baptize a dying child is a crime to be punished by severe penance, as already specified.

The same external visible idea of the Church is manifest in the Greek interpretation of the term apostolic in the ninth article of the creed. The Greek Church appropriates to herself this attribute of the true Church, as well as those just named, because she claims to have "from the apostles, without break or change, both her doctrine and the succession of the gifts of the Holy Ghost through the laying on of consecrated hands." The same claim is asserted by the Confession of Dositheus, Art. X. Precisely how this is proved does not appear. The task is quietly shirked by the catechism. The Confession makes a rash attempt to establish the claim, partly by argument, partly by history; yet it completes neither line of evidence, as if it doubted the decisiveness of each, and hoped that two inconclusive proofs might be accepted as equivalent to one demonstration. To this succession (so forcibly maintained) attaches the inheritance of apostolic office and authority. Although the Greek Hierarchy does not rise to the arrogant height of the papacy, yet it certainly is not remarkable for modesty. The high priest (for so he is called in the standards) claims to be the source of the sacred mysteries and gifts; that he alone can consecrate the holy oil, and ordain all other orders and grades in the Church, and, in the first and higher sense, bind and loose, and that his decisions are well received by God.

The chief divisions of the Greek Church, like those of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, are under the authority of patriarchs; or, like those of Russia and Greece, are governed by synods. Then follow in succession metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, constituting three orders in the ministry. To this system the "Orthodox Church" clings with desperate zeal. When, a few years since, the presence of the Presbyterian mission in Greece was thought to endanger the safety of the Greek Hierarchy, suspicion was

cast upon some of the priests as favoring the new policy. In consequence a defense of the three orders was published. Bambas and Pharmakades replied, and the latter maintained that the primitive form was not hierarchal but democratic. But the attempt at reform was fruitless. Still Greece has gained something ecclesiastically through her civil revolution. In her new constitution she has ordained her independence of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate. So Russia relieved herself of ecclesiastical dependence by the imperial demand of Peter the Great. It is evident, then, that the government of the Greek Church is not centralized like that of the papal, but is shared by several equal independent agencies, and that it is not immutable in form, since in some provinces it is patriarchal, in others synodical. These several governing agencies, convoked in one general assembly, constitute an Œcumenical Council, whose authority extends over the whole Church, and is at once supreme and universal. But, unlike the vaulting ambition of the papacy, it does not presume to stretch beyond the Church. Neither patriarch nor synod nor council has ever affected temporal sovereignty or superiority over civil rulers.

One ecclesiastical vice, however, attaches to œcumenical councils which we cannot too strongly reprobate: the assumption of infallibility. This is by no means a merely nominal claim, timidly preferred. On the contrary, it is asserted with authority and openly admitted by the Church. The Confession of Dositheus, Art. XIII, declares that as the primitive Church was taught by the Holy Spirit through the apostles and prophets, so now the Church is taught indeed by the life-giving Spirit, but by means of the holy Fathers and teachers, of whom the œcumenical holy synods are considered the rule. We also confess without doubt, as true and certain, that it is impossible for the Catholic Church to err or wander at all, or ever to choose falsehood instead of truth. For the all-holy Spirit ever operating through the holy Fathers and rulers faithfully ministering, frees the Church from errors of every kind whatsoever." This at once exalts the council (the fathers and rulers) to an equality with the apostles in inspiration and authority; and precisely comports with, and verifies what I have already shown in regard to her rule of faith and practice, that the modern Greek Church accepts tradition as not inferior to Scrip-

ture. This tradition has been and will be augmenting. Who can conjecture the limit of its unfolding, or its possible accumulation of errors and corruptions? Already it has vitiated the standard of doctrine which is the *formative* principle of the Church. Already it has destroyed her evangelicity, by corrupting her *material* principle—the doctrine of faith; and has falsified her *governing* principle by the assumption of infallibility. But more than this. It has multiplied her sacraments, and surcharged them with saving efficacy; introduced transubstantiation into the communion; produced baptismal regeneration, Mariolatry, the invocation of saints, the worship of pictures, auricular confession and penance, priestly absolution and prayers for the dead. This will appear as we proceed.

I need pause but a moment to speak of the division of the clergy into higher and lower; and the lower clergy into sacred and secular, or black and white. The former only are eligible to promotion. The latter are restricted to parochial duties. These are required to be married before entering upon their profession. On the death of his wife a secular priest may qualify himself for promotion by renouncing matrimony and entering a monastic institution. The higher clergy—bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs, are selected from among the monks. The monks consist of priests and laity; the latter attend to worldly affairs, the former to religious duties. The monastic institution is rather lay than clerical, and is not, as in the papal Church, a gigantic enginery of the priesthood, yielding a special support to the papacy; neither do like throngs of mendicant monks infest the Greek Church. Stourdza tells us that the monastic system is founded on the vicarious principle, the monks sacrificing themselves for the good of others: L'Institution des ordres monastiques n'est fondée que sur l'idée fondamentale d'une expiation voluntaire d'un innocent pour le coupable.

The bishops are regarded as "holocausts smoking on the high places—practicing celibacy in order to perfect the holiness of the sacrifice." Thus while the Greek Church dogmatically discards the doctrine of human supererogation she practically inculcates it. The principle is as false as the practice is fatal. Though the monastic system of the East has never been invested with the splendor and importance attached to it in the

West, yet we readily see that it is encouraged by the comfortable independence which it commands, by the sanctity which attends it, by the opportunity for seclusion and study, and by the hypocrisy and fanaticism of devotees. With one or two exceptions the converts adopt the same rule—the rule of St. Basil. This uniformity, Stourdza zealously declares, has preserved the Greek Church from the multiplied evils of the Latin, prominent among which is the Reformation! Her reverence for the past and her dread of reform conspire to beget in the Greek Church suspicion and dislike of Protestantism. Fear of disturbance toward her ecclesiastical repose of centuries, and her undisputed sway over the conscience and creed of her communicants, has hitherto repelled her from the advances of Protestant progress. Her movements have been retrograde. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Council, which she especially delights to honor, recognized the supremacy of the Scriptures as the final arbiter of dispute. The Greek Church has since officially declared that tradition is of equal authority. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed, which every Protestant cordially accepts, she has disfigured with appendages till its identity can scarcely be recognized. She has increased the number and nature of the sacraments till their original simplicity and significance are quite lost, and primitive spiritual worship has shared a similar fate. The two divinely authorized sacraments have been increased to seven, so that instead of Baptism and the Lord's Supper the Greek Church has ordained the Eucharist, Baptism, Chrism, Confession or Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction.

That Transubstantiation is the doctrine of the modern Greek Church cannot be reasonably questioned. Not indeed until the fourteenth century, as we are told, (Mosh., 321,) was the term introduced by Innocent III. And not until the Council of Bethlehem did the Greek Church allow the use of the word μετουσιωσις to signify the change wrought, by consecration, in the eucharistic elements. Now Stourdza asserts the dogma of the Real Presence under the transformed elements of bread and wine, as that of his Church, with some expression of astonishment that any doubt can exist respecting its truth. The words of the Oriental Confession are even more explicit: "When the priest consecrates the elements (gifts) the very

substance of the bread and of the wine is transformed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ." In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, so commonly employed in the communion service, the ceremony is called an *oblation* or *sacrifice;* and the prayer made by the deacon on receiving the sacrament contains these words: "I believe that this is thy most pure body indeed, and that this is thy holy blood indeed."

If it be objected that these are private opinions, not authoritative, we reply that authorized proofs are abundant. The Longer Catechism asks, "What is the communion?" and answers, "The communion is a sacrament in which the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very body and blood of Christ to everlasting life." And again: "The word Transubstantiation defines not the manner of the change, but the fact that the bread really, truly, and substantially becomes the very true body of the Lord, and the wine the very blood of the Lord." And this forms the chief and most essential part of the religious service. "The Duty of Parish Priests" enjoins, in regard to the Holy Communion, that before administering it the priest duly instruct them that wish to communicate that, "This, the body and blood of Christ, is not only in name what it is called, but also verily and indeed is his body and his blood under the forms of bread and wine." Upon this point proofs might be multiplied; but already is the conclusion inevitable.

My plan involved a review of the *practice* of the Greek Church in regard to Baptism, Confession, Penance, Worship of Pictures, Fasts and Feasts, Honoring Saints, praying for them and through them, Mariolatry, Exorcism, Prayer for the Dead, Absolution for the Dead, etc., etc. But such a review would necessarily be of considerable length, and therefore we dismiss it with the single remark, that the practice is more obnoxious than is the faith of "Eastern orthodoxy" to criticism.

Are there, then, no alleviating considerations, and no hopeful indications in the principles and policy of the Greek Church? In previous articles we have recognized and specified many; and no one who has read those articles will suspect us of hostile prejudice toward the Greek Church. As we have shown, in comparison with the Latin Church she has much advantage. In discarding all temporal jurisdiction she occupies Protestant

ground. In her general toleration she is well-nigh Protestant. And in her immutable hostility to the Papacy she presents a strong and steady counterpoise to Roman Catholic ambition.

At the close of this discussion we meet this practical question: Is an immediate Protestant union with the Greek Church desirable? By no means, we reply. Until she shall have eliminated the fiction of an infallible tradition from an equality with the Scriptures as her rule of faith and practice, we would withdraw and reject every proposal of union. Until she shall have amended her formal confessions and authorized standards in harmony with the word of God, we would withhold and reject every proposal of union. Until she shall have reformed in faith and practice in obedience to the divine rule, we would withhold and reject every proposal of union.

Art. IV.—CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The chronology of the Old Testament is rendered uncertain, chiefly on account of a diversity of readings in the original Hebrew text, and in the Septuagint. According to the Hebrew, the deluge occurred in the year of the world 1656; according to the Septuagint, in 2242. According to the Hebrew, Abraham was born in the year of the world 2008; according to the Septuagint, in the year 3334. According to the Hebrew, our Saviour was born in the year of the world 4000 or thereabouts; according to the Septuagint, in the year 5426.

These differences in chronology are the result, not of accident, but of design. This is evident from the very nature of them. Either the Masorites designedly *lessened* the chronology of the Old Testament, after the Septuagint translation was made, or the Septuagint translators, or some of their copyists, have designedly *lengthened* this chronology beyond that of the original Hebrew text.

The differences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint occur chiefly in the ages of the patriarchs, and they are in this wise: The Septuagint makes the life of the patriarch, at the birth of his genealogical son, one hundred years longer than the Hebrew. And then it makes his life, subsequent to the

son's birth, one hundred years shorter than the Hebrew; so that the whole life of the patriarch, in both copies, is the same. Thus the Hebrew makes Adam 130 years old at the birth of Seth; but the Septuagint makes him 230. The Hebrew makes Seth 105 years old at the birth of Enos; the Septuagint 205. The Hebrew makes Enos 90 years old at the birth of Cainan; the Septuagint 190. The Hebrew makes Cainan 70 years old at the birth of Mahalaleel; the Septuagint 170. And so, with few exceptions, the different accounts proceed; the Septuagint adding one hundred years to the life of the patriarch, at the time of the birth of his genealogical son, almost to the time of Abraham. Meanwhile, one hundred years are taken from the age of the patriarch after the birth of his son, leaving his whole life, in both copies, the same. Now it is obvious that alterations such as these could never have been made accidentally. Whichever copy may have been changed, the change must have been effected with design.

Which of these copies, then, is to be preferred? Which account is to be accepted as the true chronology of the Bible?

In favor of the Septuagint chronology it is urged that it agrees, in general, with that of Josephus. And as Josephus was acquainted with both the Hebrew and Greek, and had both copies before him at the time of writing his history, it is to be presumed that both, at that time, were what the Septuagint now is. But this argument, though plausible, is far from being conclusive. It is true that the chronology of Josephus, so far as recorded in his Antiquities, (Book i, chap. 3,) agrees nearly, though not entirely, with that of the Septuagint; but Ernesti and Michaelis both tell us that this passage in Josephus has been altered, to make it agree with the Seventy, by transcribers who had been accustomed to read the Scriptures only in the Greek version. And we have this evidence that what these critics tell us is true, that Josephus, in another place, where he has escaped the hands of false correctors, makes the time which elapsed between the creation and the deluge almost the same as that of the Hebrew. He says that the building of Solomon's temple was commenced in the year of the world 3102, and 1440 years after the deluge. (Antiq., B. viii, c. 3.) Now if we take 1440 from 3102, the remainder will be 1662, the number of years between the creation and the deluge. But

this differs only six years from the chronology of the Hebrew, which makes the time between the creation and the deluge to be 1656 years. But if Josephus wrote this latter passage, upon which no suspicion of alteration has ever fallen, the presumption is that the former statement is not from his pen, but must have been made by some of his transcribers.

In short, the chronology of Josephus, as it now stands in his history, is, in many points, inconsistent with itself. In the language of Dr. Hales, "His dates have been miserably mangled and perverted, frequently by accident, and frequently by design." The younger Spanheim, too, in his *Chronologia Sacra*, devotes a whole chapter to the errors, anachronisms, and inconsistencies of Josephus, the most of which he attributes to the mistakes of transcribers, or the hypotheses of interpreters; and concludes with representing the recovery of his genuine computations as a matter of great hazard and difficulty. But if all this be true, it is not much in favor of the Septuagint chronology that Josephus, in one of the passages above referred to, is in accordance with it.

It is urged again in favor of the Septuagint chronology that it was accepted by most of the early Christian fathers. That this statement is true there can be no doubt; and for the very good reason that most of the Christian fathers used the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and *nothing else*. They had never looked into a Hebrew Bible, and had no knowledge of the language. They were familiar with the Septuagint chronology, and quoted it, and quoted one from another. No wonder, then, that they agreed with the Septuagint.

We say that this is true of *most* of the early Christian fathers, but not of them all. Origen, the most learned biblical scholar of the third century, and Jerome of the fourth, both of whom were well acquainted with the Hebrew language, dissent from the chronology of the Septuagint. The latter agrees almost entirely with the chronology of the Hebrew, as settled by Archbishop Usher.

It is urged yet again in favor of the Septuagint chronology that the Hebrew does not afford sufficient time for connected events, and cannot be made to harmonize with the chronologies of the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Chaldeans. This objection can lie only against the period following the deluge.

The term of 1656 years, which the Hebrew allows between the creation and the deluge, was long enough surely to account for all the events occurring between these two great epochs. And if we look at the subject considerately we shall find that the Hebrew chronology, after the deluge, furnishes ample time and opportunity for all connected events.

It has been confidently urged that the pyramids, and perhaps some other structures in Egypt, could not have been built, according to the Hebrew chronology, after the deluge. And perhaps they were not. What objection to the supposition that the pyramids were built before the deluge? There can be no doubt that Egypt was inhabited before the deluge, very densely inhabited. These huge structures may have been built in those long ages, and may have resisted, like the great mountains, the engulfing waters.*

Dr. Hales insists that it is impossible to account for the populousness of the countries in which Abraham dwelt; as Mesopotamia, Canaan, and Egypt, on supposition that he lived only from five to six hundred years after the flood. But the sacred history plainly intimates that these countries were not very thickly settled at that period. When Abraham went into Canaan the country seems to have been generally open to him. "Its population," says Dr. Stanley, "was then thinly scattered over its broken surface. Here and there a wandering shepherd may have been seen driving his sheep over the mountains. The smoke of some kind of worship, now extinct for ages, was going up from altars of rough stones."† In Egypt, too, Abraham found comparatively a small people. So late as the birth of Moses, Pharoah assigned it as a reason for oppressing the Israelites, that they "are more and mightier than we." (Exod. i, 9.)

There is yet another event in the history of Abraham which shows that the people of the surrounding countries were, in his time, few and weak. Four kings came out of the east, among whom were the kings of Elam and Shinar, or what was afterward Persia and Chaldea, and wasted the land of Canaan and the adjacent countries, and then attacked and car-

* Berosus speaks expressly of ten generations who lived in Chaldea before the flood, the precise number given in Genesis. He enumerates, in order, the kings who reigned in those times, and mentions ten, from Alorus, the first, to Xisusthrus, in whose reign the deluge came. See Rawlinson's Evidences, p. 274.

† Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, p. 29.

ried captive the people of Sodom, Gomorrah, and the neighboring cities. How powerful these victorious kings were, and the kings whom they conquered, we may learn from the fact that Abraham, assisted by a few of his friends and his household servants, pursued after them, overcame them, and brought back all the goods and captives which they had carried away. (Genesis xiv.) In short, there can be no doubt that from five to six hundred years was time enough for all the people to be born and to live of whom we have any account in the days of Abraham. New England has been settled less than two hundred and fifty years, and yet its native population has almost filled the land, and has contributed not a little to fill other lands. We may see from what has taken place here among ourselves that the five hundred years and more which intervened between the deluge and the death of Abraham was time enough for the countries where he dwelt to become settled, at least to the extent in which he found them.

But we are told that the chronology of our Hebrew Bibles can never be reconciled with that of the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Chaldeans. We have heard too much of the pretended antiquity of these nations to be greatly moved by an objection of this nature. The Chinese are an ancient people; as ancient, perhaps, as any now existing on the globe. But "that their empire dates back to a period before the flood is as extravagant," says Mr. Gutzlaff, "as any of the mythological stories of the Greeks or Hindoos." They have no reliable history before the time of Confucius, which was only 550 years before Christ. All preceding this is fabulous and uncertain.

The Bible lays the foundation of the Chaldean empire in the times of Asshur and Nimrod, from one to two hundred years after the flood. No other history traces it further back than this, or so far by several hundred years.

Peleg was born, according to our Hebrew Bibles, about one hundred years after the flood, and lived through the next 240 years. In his time, we are told, "the earth was divided." It is computed that the Chinese empire may have commenced in about the hundredth year of Peleg, and the Egyptian at nearly the same time. This would give about three hundred and twenty-seven years to the death of Abraham for the founding and establishing of these kingdoms; and we know, from what has

taken place in our own country, that a great many things may be done and great changes accomplished in three hundred and twenty-seven years.*

On the whole, the arguments which have been urged in favor of the Septuagint Chronology seem to us to have little weight, and we feel inclined to rest in the accuracy of our Hebrew Bibles.

Whether the chronology of the Hebrew was altered by the Seventy or by succeeding copyists we pretend not to say. It is well known, however, that these translators had a great desire to stand well with their heathen neighbors, and that, in some instances, they did not scruple to vary their translation, having this object in view. This is specially true of the translator of the Pentateuch. "Being anxious," says J. D. Michaelis, "to render his author agreeable not only to Jews, but to foreigners, he sometimes puts forced meanings upon words, and, with still greater audacity, absolutely corrupts the reading. For, lest the Egyptian philosophers should draw something from the sacred writers in support of their own errors, or to the discredit of the Jews, he sometimes substitutes his own sentiments for those of Moses; sometimes changes the text, and makes it conform to Egyptian history, and also alters whatever might be likely to offend foreigners by its improbability. Now he who has once or twice *corrected* when he should have *translated* the original text, may well be suspected, in other instances, of doing the same." The particular motive of the translator in changing the Hebrew chronology (if he did change it) may have been to increase the age of the world, and of his own people, and thus render them more respectable in the eyes of the Egyptians.

Those who altered the Hebrew chronology seem to have done it in accommodation to certain *hypotheses* which they had adopted, but which have no foundation in truth. One of these was, that in the antediluvian age, when men lived almost a thousand years, they were not capable of having children until they were at least one hundred and fifty years old. People at that period, it was thought, were a long while in coming to maturity, as much longer than we, in proportion, as

* On this whole subject of ancient heathen chronology, see Aids to Faith, pp. 290–298.

their entire age was longer than ours. They were children till they were more than a hundred years old, and as such were incapable of procreation. That such an idea prevailed extensively among the Greeks, and with some of the Christian fathers, we have the fullest proof. In accommodation to this hypothesis it was natural that the Seventy, or those who copied from them, should add a hundred years to the lives of the patriarchs previous to the birth of their firstborn sons. In most cases they *must* do this in order to make the patriarch of a suitable age to have children at all. But the hypothesis before us is a mere assumption. It is entirely without proof, or so much as probability. What reason have we to think that human nature before the flood was not essentially the same as now, and that men did not come to *be men*, and to have families, as early in life as at the present time? Following down the history of the patriarchs to a later period we find this hypothesis contradicted by facts. The children of Jacob married young, much younger than at this day would be deemed advisable. Dinah could not have been more than sixteen years old when her hand was sought by Shechem, (Gen. xxxiv, 4;) Benjamin was not more than twenty-five when he went into Egypt with his father, yet he took with him no less than ten sons. (Gen. xlvi, 21.)

Another groundless assumption, having an influence in the same direction, was, that the son mentioned in the genealogy was uniformly the firstborn; but of this the Scriptures furnish no proof. In one instance they expressly contradict it. Seth, whose name is in the genealogy, was far from being the firstborn of Adam. And the supposition is in itself improbable that for fifteen successive generations the firstborn should uniformly be a son, and a son that lived to some hundreds of years.

Another Jewish hypothesis, which led to the lengthening of their chronology, was, that the Messiah could not come until the world had stood at least five thousand years. These must be five thousand years before the Messiah. During the sixth millenary his kingdom would be advancing in the earth, while the seventh would be a season of rest and peace. But, according to the Hebrew predictions and chronologies, the Messiah would come in about the four thousandth year of the world,

and this would be a thousand years too soon. Hence the chronology of the Old Testament must be lengthened. And the mode of lengthening it was that adopted by the Seventy, or their transcribers, as before explained.

Still another Jewish hypothesis, which led to the lengthening of their chronology, was, that the first six thousand years of the world would be equally divided in the days of Peleg, whose name signifies division, and, accordingly, the first three thousand years were supposed to end with the one hundred and thirtieth year of Peleg's life. The lengthening of the chronology, as we find it in the Septuagint, would not alone accomplish this purpose, and so the name of a new and fictitious patriarch, the second Cainan, is thrust in between Arphaxad and Selah, and a generation of one hundred and thirty years is given to him. This second Cainan is admitted on all hands to be a fictitious character. His name does not occur in the Hebrew, nor in our translation. (Gen. xi, 12.) And if the Seventy, or their transcribers, would thrust him in to carry out an hypothesis, the presumption is that they would not hesitate to make all other needful alterations.*

The evidence, so far as manuscripts and versions are concerned, is decidedly in favor of the Hebrew chronology. Indeed almost no important evidence of this kind can be urged in favor of the Seventy. For although the ancient Latin and Coptic versions, and not a few of the Greek fathers, agree with the Septuagint, they are none of them independent supporters and witnesses, but merely copyists. They copied from one another, and from the Septuagint, and of course might be expected to agree with it.

In favor of the Hebrew chronology we have, in the first place, the Targums of Onkelos and of Jerusalem. These are Chaldee paraphrases upon the Pentateuch, written, both of them, before the coming of Christ. The Targum of Onkelos is the most esteemed. This is so short and simple that it can hardly be suspected of corruption. The Targum of Jerusalem

* This second Cainan was entirely unknown to Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, and Theophilus of Antioch. It shows the obsequiousness with which many of the Christian fathers followed the Septuagint, that they foisted the second Cainan into the genealogy of Luke, (chap. iii, 36.) It is not at all likely that Luke ever placed it there.

is less reliable, but both agree with the chronology of our Hebrew Bible. And the same may be said of the old Syriac version, and of two Arabic versions. Jerome, in the fourth century after Christ, found in the Hebrew the same readings that we now have, and from it he corrected the Vulgate or Latin translation.

Besides the Septuagint, there were three other ancient Greek translations of the Old Testament, namely, those of Aquila, of Theodotian, and of Symmachus. Respecting the two first, we have no information touching the question before us; but the version of Symmachus is known to agree with the Hebrew.

The old Samaritan Pentateuch, as it now stands, agrees in part with the Hebrew, in part with the Septuagint, and in part it differs from both. But if we may believe the testimony of Jerome, the Samaritan chronology in his day agreed entirely with that of the Hebrew, in which case it must have been altered since.*

It may be urged, finally, against the Septuagint chronology, that it contradicts, in an important point, the narrative of Moses. It makes Methuselah to live several years after the flood. According to the Septuagint Methuselah was one hundred and sixty-seven years old when he begat Lamech, and Lamech was one hundred and eighty-eight years old when he begat Noah, and Noah was six hundred years old when the flood came. Putting these numbers together, 167, 188, 600, we have 955 years as the age of Methuselah at the time of the flood. But the Septuagint agrees with the Hebrew that the whole age of Methuselah was nine hundred and sixty-nine years. Of course he must have lived fourteen years after the flood.†

According to the Hebrew, Methuselah died in the very year of the flood, whether by old age, or by sickness, or by the deluge of waters, we are not informed. Lamech, the father of Noah, died five years earlier. None of the patriarchs, whose names are mentioned in the narrative, are represented in the Hebrew as living beyond the flood. All, with the exception of Noah and his family, had passed away.

* See Jerome's Questions on Genesis chap. v.

† There is some diversity of reading in the Septuagint in regard to the above numbers. We have given what is supposed to be the true reading.

Having expressed our preference for the Hebrew chronology above that of the Septuagint, and assigned our reasons for it, we would repeat the statement that, according to the Hebrew, the flood came in the year of the world 1656. Abraham was born three hundred and fifty-two years later, in the year of the world 2008. We have no contemporary history as yet with which to compare and rectify our dates.

Mizraim, a son of Ham, migrated into Egypt, and founded a kingdom there about two hundred years after the flood. He is supposed to be the Menes of Egyptian history. Some two hundred and fifty years later Abraham went into Egypt, and found a Pharaoh on the throne. Ample time had now been furnished for a kingdom to be established, and for the people to become somewhat numerous. Within about two hundred and sixteen years Jacob goes into Egypt to meet his lost son Joseph. He finds a rich and powerful kingdom under the rule of a monarch who goes by the common name of Pharaoh. Here the children of Israel remained about two hundred and fifteen years, making four hundred and thirty years in all since Abraham came to sojourn in the land of Canaan. (Gal. iii, 17.) And now they are led out of Egypt under the direction of Moses, and Pharaoh their persecutor is destroyed.

The question may be asked, whether we can identify the Pharaohs with whom Abraham and his descendants came in contact, with any of the Egyptian kings whose names are given in the catalogues of profane historians? My own impression is, that this cannot be done with any degree of certainty. The slightest inspection shows that these old catalogues are very unreliable. Several of them are little more than bare lists of names, commencing at no fixed, assignable period, and not agreeing with themselves or with one another. There is naught in them to contradict the history or the chronology of Moses, nor is there anything to enable one to say with confidence, "This is the king who entertained Abraham, and that the king who promoted Joseph, and that the king who was drowned in the Red Sea." Hence we find that those Christian writers, from Eusebius downward, who have undertaken to harmonize the Mosaic and Egyptian chronologies, and to identify the Pharaohs of Scripture with the kings of Manetho and others, have differed continuously and variously.

Hardly any two of them agree together. The reason is, and we repeat the declaration, there are no existing catalogues of the ancient kings of Egypt which are at all reliable. What may yet be discovered among the monuments and catacombs of that mysterious land we pretend not to say. We have no fear of any discoveries to contradict the Bible.

After the time of Moses the Israelites had no historical connection with the Egyptians for a long period. The next that we hear of them is in the time of Solomon. He married a daughter of Pharoah, king of Egypt, and carried on a commerce with him in horses and chariots and in linen yarn. In the reign of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against him, and conquered him, and carried away all the treasures of his house. This Shishak, or Sheshonk, was the first king of Manetho's twenty-second dynasty; but his name is not mentioned in the other catalogues. His tomb was opened by Champollion, who found in it a pictorial representation of his victory over the Jews. This event occurred in the year 970 before Christ, or five hundred and twenty years after the exode from Egypt.

From this time we frequently hear of the interference of the kings of Egypt, as also of the kings of Syria, Assyria, and Babylon, with the affairs of the Israelites, until at length Jerusalem is taken, the temple is destroyed, and both Israel and Judah are carried into captivity. Solomon's temple was destroyed in the year 538 before Christ, when it had stood four hundred and seventeen years.

After this we find the children of Israel subject, first, to the Babylonians, secondly, to the Medo-Persians, and thirdly, to Alexander and his successors, the kings of Syria and Egypt. From these they were delivered by the Maccabees, and lived for a time under their own native princes, subject to the watch and care of the Romans. At length they fell under the power of Herod, who was set over them by the Romans, and reigned as a tributary king. It is needless to trace their chronology through this long, dark period, as it is easily reckoned, and harmonizes perfectly with all that we know of the history of the surrounding nations.

Near the close of the reign of Herod *the great Light of the world* appeared. Our Saviour was born, according to Arch-

bishop Usher, in the year of the world 4004. But this, we know, was three or four years too late. Christ was born certainly before the death of Herod. And Herod died in the year of Rome 749–50, some three or four years earlier than the commencement of our vulgar era.

Again, according to Luke, (chap. iii, 42,) our Saviour was thirty years old in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cesar. But this would bring the birth of Christ in the year of Rome 749, as before.

Our Christian era was established by Dionysius Exiguus, a monk of Rome, about the year 532, and established too late by three or four years. The probability is (for we do not pretend to absolute certainty) that Christ was born in the year of the world 4000, and consequently that we are living in the year of our Lord 1871.

Art. V.—THE BRAHMO-SAMAJH.

I. Its History.

The Brahmo-Samajh is a Theistic society of Hindoos, aiming at a thorough reformation of popular Hindooism. It was founded in 1828 by Rajah Ram Mohan Roy, the most interesting character that modern India presents. The Brahmos claim him as their head, and are proud of pointing to him as occupying the same position in Brahmoism that Christ, in their opinion, occupies in Christianity. A brief sketch of this remarkable man is properly connected with the history of the Brahmo-Samajh.

Ram Mohan Roy was born at Burdwan, Bengal, in the year 1774. He was a Brahmin by caste, and his father was a wealthy and respectable man—more liberal-minded than his people generally at that day. As the son grew up it became manifest that he had a mind of no common order, and this increased the desire of his father, who doted on him, to give him the very highest education obtainable. When thoroughly instructed in his own language he began the study of Persian, that he might acquire whatever of knowledge and literature that language contained. He was sent to Patna, a city distinguished as a seat of Mohammedan

learning, where he had the best teachers of the times, and an opportunity which he enthusiastically improved, of studying not only Persian but also Arabic. Although then but a lad, he became quite familiar with Persian and Arabic literature, and found attraction in the sublime doctrine of an infinite God, supreme and alone, and felt the unfavorable contrast between this and the teachings of his own sacred books. A radical bent was doubtless given to his religious career at Patna. From this place he went to Benares—a city sacred to his own people—to complete his studies in Sanscrit amid the superior advantages there afforded. Here, to his complete satisfaction, he delved in Sanscrit lore, and threaded the labyrinths of Hindoo philosophy; only, however, to become convinced that all above the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*—the most ancient books—was mere human rubbish, full of legends, fables, and stupid fiction. In the *Vedas*, however, and their theological commentaries, the *Upanishads*, he supposed that he had found solid ground. He was overjoyed to find that these did not contain any allusion to Ram Krishna, Ganesh, Kali, and a host of other revengeful, licentious, and filthy divinities. Thus, from the teachings of the Koran and of his own ancient sacred books, he rested in the belief of one infinite holy God.

At the age of fifteen years he returned to his home, the pride of his unsuspecting father, to begin the most remarkable moral and intellectual movement of modern India. He was saddened at the blindness and deep degradation, moral and mental, that wrapped his people in a mantle of night, and determined to do something to break the spell that bound them.

In his sixteenth year he issued a book boldly challenging the correctness of modern Hindooism. This at once aroused against him the indignation and persecution of bigoted Brahmins, and he was driven from his home. He wandered extensively through India, and even passed over into Thibet, busy all the while examining and comparing religious systems. After four years he returned, at the request of his father—who had followed him with an anxious and affectionate heart—but only to renew his conflict with the Brahmins. He continued these efforts for years, slowly gathering about him a few converts.

Meanwhile, having thoroughly acquired English, he also studied Greek, that he might read the New Testament in the original. He was enraptured with the teachings of Christ and his apostles, and cheerfully acknowledged that nothing in the Vedas would compare with them. He published in Bengalee, and also in English, a book called "The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Happiness." In 1828 he gave the movement he had set on foot a regular organization under the name of the *Brahm-Sabha*, or Society of the Worshipers of God. A creed was partially formed, and times of meeting, with a routine of religious service, appointed.

In 1830 Ram Mohan Roy was chosen by the king of Delhi as his embassador in London. Here he identified himself, as it seems, with the Unitarian Christians, while still clinging to the Vedas; and here, in 1833, he died, a man as remarkable for the ingenuous liberality of his mind, as for the genius that marked his whole career. With him originated the interesting movement called Brahmoism, likely to affect very radically and extensively for good or evil the destinies of India. The real belief of Ram Mohan Roy is to this day matter of query and doubt. Perhaps an attempt to define his faith clearly would be doing more for him than he ever did for himself. For the Mohammedans, as authority accepted by himself, he quoted the Koran—so of the Holy Scriptures for Christians, and of the Vedas and Shastras for Hindoos. This he did from the belief that inspiration is a gift enjoyed, in greater or less degree, by all the race. The estimate he placed on Christ is still a question with Christians and educated Hindoos who were acquainted with his opinions. He seems at least to have given him the supreme place among men. "A day may soon arrive," said he, "when every one will regard the precepts of Jesus as the sole guide to peace and happiness." After his death it was claimed by some persons in England that Ram Mohan Roy was a Unitarian or Socinian. This called forth a letter from Bishop Luscombe of Paris, in which he mentions a long conversation had with him regarding his belief in the Trinity. "He assured me," wrote the bishop, "that the first chapter according to St. John was sufficient to convince him of the divinity of Jesus Christ; and 'even the first verse,' said he, 'says enough on the subject to confirm me in my adhesion to

this doctrine;' whereupon he quoted to me the passage in Greek." Nevertheless, from statements made at other times, the faith of this singular man is left in doubt.

In 1828, before Ram Mohan Roy went to England, he organized, as we have seen, what was called the Brahm-Sabha or Brahmo-Samajh. On his death in 1833 a few able men from among his followers took up the work of reformation, chief among whom was Baboo Debendronath Tagore, a man of ability, and who then really became the head of the movement about which a considerable number of converts rallied. A few years after the death of Ram Mohan Roy the reformation he had set on foot declined in interest; but in 1839 the impulse he had given the native mind burst forth anew. The old Brahm-Sabha was supplemented by another organization under the name of the *Tattwabodhini Sabha*, a kind of missionary society for the Brahm-Sabha. From this time the society assumed an aggressive attitude, and efforts were made to propagate more largely the new faith. A press was set to work, schools were opened, and branch societies established in several places. In 1845 an event occurred which affected radically the character of the Brahmo-Samajh.

Ram Mohan Roy had taught that the Vedas are a reliable revelation. But from some cause a suspicion was excited in the mind of Debendronath Tagore that all was not right even in the Vedas, and accordingly he sent four pundits (religious teachers) to Benares to ascertain carefully what were the real teachings of the Vedas. For two years they closely studied their meaning, then returned to Calcutta with the result of an investigation fatal to Vedantism. It was with no little surprise that the Brahmists found that they had been resting on a defective foundation. They found that the Vedas contain untenable dogmas, and from that time they swung off more completely to natural religion—acknowledging as their only certain guide pure intuition and the light of nature—and claiming to rest in Theism. A book called the Brahm-Dharma, (the theistic religion,) being compilations from the Hindoo scriptures, was published in 1851. It contains the creed of the Brahmists, as they were called at that time, and is their "confession of faith." It has not, however, been satisfactory to all, but has been the cause of some stormy dissensions among

Brahmists. More recently this Indian Rationalism or Theism has been called *Brahmoism* and its adherents *Brahmos*. The society is always now called the *Brahmo-Samajh*—"Samajh" meaning a society or assembly.

II. Present Condition of the Brahmo-Samajh.

What, then, are the Brahmos? what are they doing? and what are their prospects?

As has been seen in the development so far of the movement called Brahmoism, there have been two marked stages. When first the Hindoo mind, through this peculiar revelation, began to awake from the night of depraved ignorance and blighting superstition that had brooded on it like a mighty incubus for twenty-five centuries, as if loth to leave entirely the vast temple of error so long its home, it rested for a time in Vedantism. Down through the fungous growth of ages stratum after stratum was cut away, until below all, in the clear and apparently divine utterances of the ancient Vedas, a secure and infallible foundation was supposed to be found. The Vedas became for a time a certain guide. *Vedantism* is a vague idealism. It is claimed that it is monotheistic, and that it does not teach idolatry and the system of caste. But restless intellect, so recently unchained, would exert itself, and even the Vedas were scrutinized so closely and frankly that Vedantism went to the wall. Thus cut loose from the authority of a written revelation, it was thought that no more reliable guide could be found than the voice of intuition and the teachings of natural religion. Theism, or the second stage of this development, has been reached. The Brahmos profess now to rest in pure Theism, and to affiliate closely with the Francis Newman school of England, and the Theodore Parker school of America. Their creed—if Theism may be said to have a creed—embraces the following cardinal points:

1. There exists one eternal supreme God, infinite in all his attributes, good and merciful.

2. He is spirit, hence without form.

3. From his worship and service alone can happiness be enjoyed here and hereafter.

4. The worship of God consists in acts of devotion and praise, and his service in the practice of virtue.

5. The soul is liable to transmigration until thoroughly purified, and prepared for the region of eternal blessedness.

6. The only true revelation is pure intuition, by which the thoughtful and virtuously disposed can discover truth and the path of duty.

These items include the main points in the belief of the Brahmos; but of course there must be a multiplicity of opinions on minor points of faith, at least among men who profess to be guided by the vague and shadowy light of intuition and nature. Besides these general enunciations of the principles of their belief, the Samajh has a covenant to which its members subscribe, containing a list of rules for daily life and conduct. These are concerned chiefly with the worship of God, the general practice of virtue, and efforts for the propagation of Brahmoism. The main points on which the Samajh insists are a renunciation of idolatry and polytheism; the abolition of caste, polygamy, and infant marriages; female education, the introduction of women into society, and purity of morals. The difficulty of rapid and abrupt changes is recognized, and considerable latitude given to questions of expediency. But just on this point, in 1865, a pretty complete schism occurred in the Samajh. A progressive party became of the opinion that certain rules of practice and forms of worship were not consistent with the doctrines of Brahmoism, and demanded a change. Others, whose intuitions, somehow, were not so clear, and for whom nature shed a different light, wished to conserve the old position and forms. The contention has not yet become so sharp as to part the Samajh entirely asunder, but has resulted in two parties in it, giving us a pointed comment on the clear light of nature and intuition, and another proof of the wisdom of God in granting us a *written* and authoritative revelation. One of these parties is called the conservative, and the other the progressive party, and they are making efforts at reconstruction.

A word on the form of worship adopted by the Brahmos may not be devoid of interest. In their writings they speak of themselves as a Church, using much of the ecclesiastical phraseology current among Christians. Each society gives its place of worship, or the assembly itself, a name, after the manner of Christian Churches. There is in Calcutta an

assembly of females called the *Brahmica Samajh.* Females now, in some instances, worship in the same assembly with men, but have secluded seats. The Brahmos meet in halls or chapels appointed for the purpose, and remain seated during service, which is considerably modeled after the forms of Christian worship. It consists of recitative prayers and praises from a printed ritual or book of worship. Sermons are read and extempore prayers offered. The service is interspersed with singing and chanting, accompanied by an instrument, generally a harmonium. After all intuition and the light of nature have done for the Brahmos, their awkward aping of Christians is badly concealed. The entire number of Brahmos at present is not known, but they number many thousands, and are of all grades, from the fast youth who laughs at the stupidity of his old Hindoo father, and eats beef* in the Calcutta saloons, to the timid Nicodemuses, who come to their teachers by night. There are now fifty-four Samajhes or assemblies throughout India; of these fifty are in Bengal, which at present contains the native brain of India. The Calcutta Samajh, the oldest, has held its thirty-sixth anniversary. More than half the samajhes have been established in the last ten years, and show that the society has more than doubled in less than one third of the time it has existed. It has eight theological schools for regular instruction in Brahmoism, and is also taking up the work of purely secular education. The Calcutta College was founded by the leading members of the samajh in Calcutta. The society has conducted in its interests for the inculcation of Theism seven what they would call religious papers. Besides these are four more strictly secular and political papers, conducted by Brahmo editors, and containing a decided Brahmic element. Two of them, "*The Indian Mirror*" and "*National Paper*," are published in English. The society's press in Calcutta has issued a number of books and tracts, both in Bengalee and English. Brahmoism has no system of ordination by which a ministry is regularly set apart for the propagation of this faith, and the edification of believers. Yet there are now at least eight men actively engaged as missionaries, giving their whole time to the work of spreading this Indian Theism among their countrymen.

* The cow is sacred to the Hindoos, and to eat its flesh is a mortal sin.

Such, then, is the state of Brahmoism at the present time, with its fifty-four samajhes or congregations scattered from Lahore in the Punjaub to Madras in the south—with its press and literature and periodicals, with its schools and missionaries.

And there is purpose and unity in this movement. In October, 1864, a Representative Council was organized in Calcutta, with a view to uniting all the samajhes in unity of plan, action, and sympathy. This meets annually, and is intended to have a representative from each congregation. The aggressive character of the movement is seen in efforts to send forth and maintain a regular staff of missionaries, among whom there is a show of piety and disinterested devotion to a definite aim. The following is from the leader of the Calcutta Samajh. Speaking of their missionaries, he says:

> Humble, and not trusting in their own, but in the Lord's strength, these itinerant missionaries have gone about in different directions, preaching the saving truths of Brahmo-Dharmo, and through divine mercy success has invariably crowned their labors. May the Brahmo-Samajh live to fulfill her grand mission, and may her missionaries, by precept and example, by self-denial and martyr heroism, prove instrumental, under God's guidance, in delivering India from the curse of idolatry, and blessing its teeming population with light and life.

Missionaries, in their expectation of the final triumph of Christianity in India, can hardly excell the calm confidence of these men. Another Brahmo writes thus:

> When we find society is progressing, and men in general are marching onward, and the Brahmo missionaries are working with their head and heart, doubt not a time is fast approaching when Brahmo religion—the pure heaven-born religion—will be the prevailing religion of the world, and establish union and brotherhood among all the nations of the earth, severing asunder the shackles of superstition and sectarianism.

A few extracts from the literature and journalism of the men who propose to convert India and the world may serve to illustrate the stage of their English and thinking. Nations, it is said, have, just as individuals, a mental growth from childhood to manhood. Almost all India is yet in mere mental childhood. In Bengal the mental life of the nation has reached the state of boyhood, with here and there an

individual case of something like real manhood. Generally, however, we have even here only the boyish sophomoric aping of big thoughts and philosophic ideas that often amusingly mark the transition from boyhood to manhood. Note the not altogether unsuccessful grasping after the philosophical in the following:

Idolatry is not the peculiar institution of our country. In one shape or other it has existed in every country. It is, so to say, the logical condition of the development of man's religious consciousness. Knowledge begins in the concrete—the abstract is only reached after a process of generalization. The infant hardly knows man from the beast; and when it begins to know this distinction it is from the features of its parents, of its nurse, or of those near it. As it grows up it recognizes its species distinctly, and advancing still further in life, it forms at last the abstract conception of the soul.

Some one, aspiring to give to the world something after the style of Solomon, runs on thus in a little aphoristic book called "True Faith:"

Faith is singular, and moves in its own ways, which are past finding out.

Geography cannot find its latitude and longitude; nor can arithmetic compute its age, nor history portray its true life.

Philosophy hideth its face in shame, after vainly exerting to ascertain its why and wherefore.

Verily its actions are unintelligible to the world, and its life is a deep mystery.

Another benevolent-minded Brahmo throws open his charitable heart for native Christians thus:

It is, however, not to be denied, that a few are really charmed with the beauty of Christianity, and convinced of its truth. They take its shelter because they fondly hope it can meet their spiritual demands and give them salvation. The outward surroundings of Christianity are so vivid, captivating, and popular, so full of imagination and gossip, and the indwelling truths glitter now and then with such a benignant ray, that some who have recently learned to disbelieve in Hindooism are delighted to discover such an easy staircase to the kingdom of heaven. To such great pity is due.

A zealous Brahmo gave vent to the pious prophetic rapture of his soul thus:

It is evident, from revolutionary movements and every-day occurrences, that the last day of existing religions is at hand. It is our highest gratification to prognosticate, that after such a long time we will be in a position to take leave of all false religions, and hail Brahmoism as the harbinger of the world's real greatness and happiness. . . . The bishops and all other divines may join together to make common cause to put it down; still Brahmoism will not be checked. It will daily, and I hope hourly, grow amid all the terrors, perils, and trials; and the Brahmo missionaries will always be forward in inculcating the saving truths of pure Theism, and propounding schemes for its rapid advancement, and will ever persevere in doing so till the last drop of blood runs through their veins.

There is something to be admired in the tone of the sturdy purpose that finds expression here, and we may well hope that it is something more than awkward verbal aping, and that it may yet find vent in a nobler cause.*

One more example is given, which is evidently the utterance of a full-grown man. It is from perhaps the best Brahmo mind in India.

The cutivated tastes of educated natives cannot long submit to the hundred and one pernicious institutions of the country, which are at once a scandal to their reason, a shame to their nationality, and a bar to all material and spiritual advancement. And hence it is, that for some time past there has been a ceaseless and irresistible struggle to shake off all abuses and corruptions which are offensive to the educated mind. The abolition of suttee and infanticide, the establishment of the Brahmo-Samajh, the legalization of widow remarriage, the founding of girls' schools, and the present agitation against the multitudinous evils of polygamy, are among the most significant and cheering results of that struggle, and constitute the splendid trophies which western education has directly or indirectly achieved in this country within the short space of thirty-six years. Well may we exult amid this bright scene of reform and progress, and sincerely grateful must we feel to those earnest-minded natives and Europeans who, by wise counsel and philanthropic action, have brought it about: and all honor to those who are laboring to advance still further the cause of India's civilization, and realize that great future that awaits her.

These samples may serve in some degree to show the state and culture of the native mind engaged in this reform. An interesting query is,

* The natives of India are sadly wanting in independent manly vigor generally.

III. What Light does it throw on the Problem of the Evangelization of India?

We can here enter into but a meager consideration of a few ideas suggested by observation, and the nature of the Brahmo-Samajh reform.

1. Strictly speaking this whole movement is one of *reason* rather than of religion. In other words, it is more the result of intellect revivified and aroused to its true and normal action, so that of necessity and by compulsion it divests itself of old forms of belief, and of a dwarfed and unnatural existence. It is this, rather than the result of moral and religious impulses in some way put in motion. The philosophy of the movement may be thus briefly stated: The diffusion of knowledge rendered untenable old incorrect ideas and forms of belief. The spread of true mental light of necessity dispelled the error and darkness of minds with which it came in contact. The medicinal or curative influence of true knowledge and science restored mind to its normal laws of reason and belief, and rendered it incapable of a diseased form of action, and of retaining its erroneous form of belief. Let the mental vision be beclouded with the films of ignorance, the growth of centuries—let the mental retina be paralyzed by a thousand superstitions and errors—and men will be seen as trees walking. But cut away the films from that vision, and let mellow floods of healing light play upon that retina, and men will be seen as men, and trees as trees. It is not easy to trace the process by which the Hindoo mind was overgrown by such a superstratum of error; how it suffered itself to become paralyzed by such astonishing and puerile credulity. The fact we have before us, and with evidence that formerly a remarkable degree of scientific and religious light was enjoyed. In the Brahmo-Samajh we have an example of what true knowledge can do in restoring helpless intellect. The scales gradually fell from the mind of an intelligent youth as he moved about, inspired with a thirst for knowledge wherever it might be found. It is not difficult for us to discover how he received the first awakening impulse. Right manfully did he strive to impart the light he had received to those around him, and when he fell the torch was taken up and borne forward by a

worthy successor. He still lives, though stricken in years, to behold with admiration the movement of a new life in the corpse of Hindooism. Still, it is rather an intellectual movement, lacking the ardor and moral enthusiasm that naturally belongs to a religious reformation. Indeed, as a so-called Theistic movement it could hardly be otherwise. There is nothing in mere Theism to inspire religious fervor, such as fills the true Christian's heart. Nothing short of a definite written revelation can inspire this. For enfeebled, alienated humanity, nothing short of the incarnation—God manifest in the flesh—can do this. All else falls short of bridging the vast gulf that separates fallen man from God, and leaves him to wander in the cold mental realms of speculation and conjecture.

2. But thus much we have learned from Brahmoism: Hindooism cannot stand before the spread of correct knowledge. To the friends of education in India this is an encouraging and significant fact. Where a correct knowledge of history and natural science is acquired with logical habits of thought, popular Hindooism becomes perfectly untenable. Education has proved itself a Hercules that could burst the gyves which bound the Indian Prometheus to his gloomy rock, where for long weary centuries the vulture of idolatry and superstition had devoured his vitals. Looking simply at what enlightened education has done in Bengal, we may know that, strongly intrenched as Hindooism has proved itself to be, even in education we have the key to its position. Already its flank has been successfully turned. To use another figure, we know where Samson may be afflicted, and we should improve the lesson well.

There need be no fear here of elevating human agencies and influences in importance over the divine power of the Gospel. God works, and manifests his wonderful providence and power *through* just such agencies. True Christianity marvelously spread throughout the Roman empire apparently without the aid of an educational establishment. Yet it should be borne in mind that schools of philosophy had done for Ephesus, and Corinth, and Rome, just what enlightened education is doing for India. Hindooism would in the end yield to enlightenment, even if Christianity did not enter the arena. If the Church

and missionaries do their duty, it will enter when and wherever in God's providence a breach is made.

The Brahmo reform, as a result of enlightened education, throws some light on the probable fate of Mohammedanism. Generally Mohammedanism is considered as promising less success to Evangelism than Hindooism. There is something so subtle in its error, something so plausible in its pretensions, such an admixture and semblance of truth in the system, that it seems much less vulnerable than Hindooism. No wonder that one long and well acquainted with Mohammedanism suggests its probable origin in diabolic inspiration. Still a careful consideration of the question leads to the conclusion that the proud, specious dogmatism of Islam must yield to the logic of enlightened education. Its unscientific assertions—or rather, its opposition to science, and its illogical teachings—render it, equally with Hindooism, untenable to enlightened minds. It is impossible that a system the error of which, after all, is so palpable and transparent, will not fall when a good degree of enlightenment is brought to bear upon it. How can well-informed minds cling to a professed revelation which contains statements and ideas directly opposed to correct science; which statements are not simply an adaptation of figure and language to the apparent condition of things or language that may be harmonized with the developments of science, but flat dogmatic contradiction of the known condition of things?

According to the Koran, the sun sets in a spring of black mud, which Dhulkarnain (supposed to be Alexander) saw, who also visited the place where the sun rises. The earth is represented as flat, and the mountains are placed upon it as great weights to keep it steady. Meteors are fiery stones hurled at stealthy devils climbing up the sky to pry into the secrets of heaven. An enlightened mind can hardly fail to detect the work of an ignorant impostor in all this. Again, the Koran with the whole system of Islam is absurdly illogical. It demands belief without evidence, and stamps a spirit of inquiry or investigation as base infidelity. It holds, with Christianity, that religion has been given to the world in dispensations rising by each addition in spirituality and higher, clearer morality; and yet, while claiming that in this way Christianity has been superseded by Mohammedanism, just as Judaism was super-

seded by Christianity, fails to see that Mohammedanism would roll the race back into a materiality and ritualism far below Christianity, and but little above Judaism, while its morality sadly lacks the purity and elevation of either. Further, it speaks of one revelation or communication abrogating another, and yet fails to see the absurdity of an earlier communication abrogating a later, as is the predicament in some instances in the Koran, as taught and understood. We are also presented with the inconsistency of one *moral principle* abrogating another: of the Koran admitting on the one hand the divine authority of the New Testament, and yet on the other hand controverting its history and doctrines; and that, too, when the uncorrupted preservation of the New Testament is unchallenged! These palpable fallacies, together with the "earthly, sensual, and devilish" spirit of Islamism, must in the end betray its real origin to enlightened minds. If nothing else, at least a rational reform must set in against it, as is now the case against Hindooism. The fact may be noted that India is the only place where anything like a true liberal education is being brought to bear generally upon Mohammedans. In Turkey, and all the states dependent on the Sublime Porte, the dogmas of Islamism, with the Koran and commentaries on it, form the chief part of the system of education. As it seems impossible for intellect, duly enlightened and drilled into a logical appreciation of historical and general evidence, to rest in anything so grossly illogical as Mohammedanism, we may yet see the first great effective breach made in it on the soil of India. Already enough is seen in the movement called Brahmoism to show the importance of education in connection with Evangelism. Nothing narrow should characterize views and efforts in the great work of overthrowing Hindooism and Islamism. The work is destructive as well as constructive. We must tear down before we can build. Among simple aboriginal tribes in some parts of India missionaries entered upon what seemed to be unoccupied ground, and built up with wonderful success, because they were spared much heavy labor in the way of demolition. Hindooism and Mohammedanism are grim old castles, strong in the accumulated fortifications of centuries, and they must be breached and beaten down before the work of construction can successfully

take place. If in God's providence education shows itself to be an effective battery in demolishing the strongholds of the enemy, it should be well manned and worked with vigor.

4. Regarding the future of the Brahmo-Samajh, it is difficult to divine much. It is not to be a harmonious movement, for already it is sadly divided on prudential questions. From its very boasted intuitional foundation it must be subject to frequent and continual schisms. However, the real danger that this reform has for Evangelism is not to be despised. Silently but surely the sapping and mining processes of education are causing popular Hindooism to tumble; but it would be a sad victory, if, as the process goes on in the country, a Rationalism or Deism worse than ever cursed Germany and France, should follow in its wake. This just now seems to be the danger. Brahmoism is Rationalism and Deism struggling with Christianity over the ruins of Hindooism for the mastery of India. Ultimate victory cannot be doubtful for Christianity, but the delay of triumph for some generations would be a result much to be deplored. By anticipating danger here, effort should be made to avert what it threatens. Every Indian missionary must familiarize himself with the deistic, rationalistic, and neo-religious questions of the day which apparently are to repeat themselves in India. The deadliest battles of Indian Evangelism may be fought on this ground. Education and enlightenment are inevitable. So much the more reason why missionaries should educate vigorously, imparting education with gospel truth in it, and striving to institute a counter revolution—one that will, by the Divine blessing, thoroughly checkmate this Indian Theism, and give to the people the blessing of sanctified enlightenment and Christianity.

Art. VI.—MIGNE'S ROMAN CATHOLIC PUBLISHING HOUSE.

Bibliothèque Universelle du Clergé et des Laiques Instruits. (Circular.) Paris, Migne, 1867.

Jacques-Paul Migne was born on the 25th of October, 1800, at St. Flour, a village of the department of Cantal, in the heart of France. He was early destined for the Church; and after pursuing his theological studies at the seminary of Orleans, he was ordained priest in 1824. In 1825 he was appointed *curé* of Puiseaux, in the department of Loiret. He had some difficulties in this charge with his diocesan, Bishop Beauregard; but what the trouble was is not stated in the authority * from which we derive this brief biographical introduction. The fruit of it was, however, that he resigned his post. In 1833 he came to Paris and determined to devote himself to literature, but always in the service of the Roman Catholic Church. His first essay was the establishment of a newspaper, *l'Univers Religieux*, which afterward became the *Univers*, so celebrated as the organ of Ultramontanism, under the able but unscrupulous editorship of that warlike son of the Church, Mons. Veuillot. While in the Abbé Migne's hands, the journal sought to avoid the strife of parties which raged so bitterly within the bosom of the Apostolical (!) Church of France, and to be simply and purely a "Catholic" journal, (*catholique avant tout.*) The Abbé's industry was indefatigable; and his devotion to his task is shown by the number of articles signed L. M. in the old volumes of the journal. But newspaper work was not the Abbé's mission. He found his place and proper work in 1836, when he opened a printing office, on a small scale, in a suburb of Paris, (Petit-Montrouge.) Thirty years have passed, and now the "Book Concern" is one of the most vast, and at the same time one of the most complete establishments for the manufacture of books in the world. One of the recent catalogues concludes with the following notice:

If you desire to see in operation all the arts and processes of typography, you are invited to visit the *Catholic Workshops* at Petit-Montrouge. Type-founding, stereotyping, printing, binding,

* Vapereau, Dictionnaire des Contemporains, pp. 1215.

are all going on at once within the walls of the establishment, and on a scale which is not rivaled by the Imperial Printing-office. In all the processes where it can be utilized, steam-power is employed. Our capacity of production is so enormous that we can turn out *two thousand* quarto volumes every twenty-four hours. A monk of the middle ages could not copy in three years the number of pages printed in this establishment in one minute.

That this account is not exaggerated will appear from the statements given in the course of this article.

The latest catalogue issued by the Abbé Migne is now before us; and it affords, within itself, not only material for forming a judgment of the great task achieved by the industry and skill of a single man, and that man a priest, in a sphere of business quite foreign, one would think, to his education and habits, but also an insight into the means by which this great success has been accomplished. The very external appearance of the catalogue is a characteristic indication. It is a dingy pamphlet of forty pages, printed on coarse paper, with small type, crowding a vast amount of matter into a small space. A single number of Longman's or Rivington's monthly announcements would cost more money, we should judge, to get up. It opens with the Abbé's "Profession of Faith," prefaced with the *naïve* remark that those who think they are better Romanists than the author may "make a better confession if they can; the pages of *La Verité* (a journal issued by the Abbé) are open to receive it!" This "profession" begins with a declaration that all the publications of the *Ateliers Catholiques* are submitted to the judgment of the Holy See. "I approve what the Pope approves; I condemn what he condemns: I recognize in the Holy See my master, my teacher, and my judge: my feeble learning is eclipsed by its science, as the light of a torch is outshone by the sun at noonday. . . . The Church of Rome is my mother; her name is ever on my lips; I rejoice in her triumphs and grieve with her griefs. She is the queen of all Churches; how much more the sovereign of a poor priest!" The Church of Rome is for the Abbé, the head of the mystical body of Catholicism; the center of unity; the source of all law; the interpreter of the truth; the rule of justice and the oracle of morals; the arbiter of controversies; the infallible guardian of the sacred deposit of the faith. All these heads are enlarged upon in the "Profession," which concludes with the following apostrophe:

O Holy Roman Catholic Church! so essential art thou to mankind, that if God had not founded thee, man must have organized thee, for the government and guidance of the intellectual and moral world. My printing-office, I trust, will reproduce, before my labors are ended, all the oracles to which thou hast given birth from the Ascension of thy Divine Spouse until the present time; and thus present, for the wonder of men, the inexhaustible riches of thy wisdom, prudence, and holiness. May my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I ever publish a word to thy injury. . . . Thou knowest my heart and my purposes, that they are pure. I am nothing, and can do nothing of myself; wisdom, science, strength, must come to me from on high. I have no other aims than the glory of God, of the Virgin, and of thee, O Holy Church; and the good of the clergy and the people, without honor or earthly recompense for myself.

O Holy Roman Catholic Church! my labors began through thee; I continue them, and hope to end them through thee; that I may rest in thee; aided by the grace of God and sustained by the Immaculate Mother of the Saviour. May the clergy second my endeavors, so that I may courageously bring to an end my great publications, namely, the Sacred Books; the Fathers; the Councils; the Bullarium; the Theology; the Apologetics; the Sacred Eloquence; the Church History; the Canon Law; the Liturgics, etc., and then the world will see me, in spite of persecutions, jealousies, and rash judgments, at last reproduce, *at a low price*, all the great works of Catholicism without exception.

Our readers will notice how simply and naturally the Abbé glides into a telling "advertisement," at the very close of his devotional apostrophe to Mother Church and the Virgin Mary. It is clear that he was a born merchant. He would have made his fortune in any trade by sheer dint of advertising skill.

The most important part of the document, in a literary point of view, is a special prospectus of sixteen pages, addressed to the Roman Catholic clergy and to "the educated laity," in which an account is given, somewhat in detail, of the chief publications of the Concern. A catalogue of two hundred compact pages is promised, to contain minute accounts of all the publications, with a thousand Episcopal letters of commendation. But from the statements in the small catalogue before us, as well as from personal inspection of many of Abbé Migne's publications, we proceed to give our readers some account of them.

First, and most important, is the "Complete Course of the Greek and Latin Fathers." This immense collection includes all the Fathers, Doctors, and Ecclesiastical writers, from the

apostolical age down to the time of Innocent III., (A. D. 1216,) for the Latin writers, and for the Greeks, down to the time of the Council of Florence, (A. D. 1439.) The Abbé's prospectus asserts that in this collection the best editions have been followed, and that great pains have been taken in collating the various editions, and in many cases also in comparing them with the manuscripts.

Ample indexes are given, both alphabetical and analytical, amounting in all to no less than two hundred and forty tables; "so arranged that not only the scholar, but the ordinary reader, can discern what he wants among the treasures of patristic erudition." The good Abbé, with his usual skill in advertising, further announces that "this edition is preferable to any other, in view of its paper and printing, its convenience of form, the integrity of the texts, the great cheapness of the work, and the vast advantage of having in one collection, completely indexed and chronologically arranged, the works of *all* the Church writers, including the smallest fragments, heretofore scattered through multitudinous books and manuscripts, very difficult, and in some cases impossible, to obtain."

The Latin Fathers fill, with the indexes, two hundred and twenty-two volumes, imperial octavo. The Greek writers (with Latin versions) take up one hundred and sixty-seven volumes of the same size. The Latin version of the Greek Fathers is also published separately in eighty-four volumes. The greatest marvel, perhaps, of this vast undertaking, is the cheapness of the books. The Latin Fathers are sold, (when the whole set is taken,) in paper covers, at five francs (one dollar in gold) the volume; the Greek Fathers, with the Latin version, at eight francs, ($1 60 gold;) the Latin versions, alone, at five francs again. If the volumes are bound in half sheep, an additional charge of thirty-five cents a volume is made. When it is remembered that the books are all in imperial octavo, (called in French usage *quarto*,) their extraordinary cheapness will be at once recognized.

For purposes of reference, there can be no question that this is the most convenient series of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical writers ever published. Complaints are made of many of the volumes, (and justly,) that sufficient care has not been taken with the editing, in spite of Abbé Migne's advertise-

ment; and it is further charged, that, in some cases, the old literary policy of the Church of Rome, of modifying, omitting, and even garbling, for polemical purposes, has been followed by Migne. For the study of special authors there are, certainly, editions to be had more accurate and trustworthy than Migne's; and no student who desires to be thorough in critical study would ever be satisfied without comparison of various editions. But with all drawbacks, the fact remains that the *Cursus Completus Patrologiæ* is an indispensable necessity to every large theological library. How many copies of the whole series have been sold in this country we do not know. There is a copy in the library of Dickinson College; and one has been ordered for the Drew Theological Seminary.

To the list of the Fathers in this catalogue, the Abbé Migne appends a characteristic bit of exhortation to his clerical brethren. The Fathers and Doctors, he tells them, constitute the chain of Catholic tradition, and the most important treasure of the Church next to the Scriptures; all the schools of theology commend the study of the Fathers; all writers on theology recommend them; and, finally, no professor or preacher can be eminent who does not place his lectures or sermons upon the solid foundation of the Fathers, as well as of the Scriptures. After this preamble, which every good priest will of course admit, the skillful advertising exhortation comes in:

> Is there *any* complete edition of the Fathers but ours? Is there *any*, giving all the authors, complete as to substance, uniform in size and form, correct as to text, cheap as to price? Can any priest now say, honestly, that the Fathers are hard to obtain or dear to buy? Is it not clear, then, that the priest who does not possess them is lacking, either in Christian intelligence, or in practical faith?

The following touch is inimitable:

> Even to have this complete edition of the Fathers ranged on your library shelves will exalt you in the eyes of all who see it there. They will admire you for preferring to invest your savings in this way, rather than in the public funds or in other investments, to many of which the clergy devote themselves with a zeal ill-becoming their sacred profession, subjecting themselves to all the agitations of mind which attend the possession of property whose value is perpetually fluctuating.

The next great work in the list is a "Complete Course of Commentaries on the Scriptures," in Latin, comprised in

twenty-eight imperial octavo volumes, and sold at twenty-eight dollars, in paper covers. The Vulgate is given, with a French translation facing it; and all the greatest commentators of the Roman Church are included in the series. We have not personally examined this series, and cannot therefore speak critically of it; but Migne asserts that no commentary is inserted in it which did not unite in its favor the voices of the chief bishops and theologians of the Roman Church in Europe, all of whom were consulted as to its publication. A biography of each author is given. Parallel with the series of commentaries is the "Complete Course of Theology," also in twenty-eight volumes, of the same size and price, and edited in the same way. The authors who, by common consent, have treated any special branch of theology with pre-eminent skill, are chosen in that branch; so that the collection, while it constitutes an entire and complete system of Roman theology, gives what are supposed to be the best treatises extant on each subdivision. The Abbé's genius for advertising finds play again with reference to these two courses. "Whoever possesses them may say to himself, No matter what commentaries or treatises of theology are published, I care not, for I have the very best on my shelves; and I may devote myself wholly to the study of them, without need, on the one hand, of buying other authors at random, and without risk, on the other, of remaining ignorant on any important point in Scripture or theology. How many times, before the publication of these two series, would the poor pastor be heard to say, 'O, if I could gather together the great writers on the Scriptures and on theology, with what zeal and fruit would I devote myself to study them.' Well, then, what was once a dream is now a reality. You need no longer say, 'The good books are beyond the deep, or on the heights, who shall fetch them?' but rather say, 'They are nigh unto you.' If you do not get them, the fault is your own. *O sacerdotes, attendite.*"

The fourth series of publications consists of the "Démonstrations Evangéliques," a collection of writers on the Evidences of Christianity. We deem it worth while to give, in a note, the whole title of this vast repository of Apologies for Christianity.* It will be seen that the list contains not merely the

* Démonstrations Evangéliques. De Tertullien, Origène, Eusèbe, S. Augustin, Montaigne, Bacon, Grotius, Descartes, Richelieu, Arnauld, de Choiseul-du-Plessis-

names of the ancient apologists, and those of the Roman Catholic Church, but also those of all the principal Protestant writers on the evidences of Christianity. The word *intégralement* in the title of the work is not strictly correct, as those passages in Protestant writers which impugn the Roman Church or its doctrines, are generally omitted. The collection, nevertheless, is a very valuable one for the history of Apologetics. The series is preceded by an introductory volume, by the Abbé Chassay, entitled "Préparation Evangélique," and aiming, like its celebrated namesake, the Præparatio Evangelica of Eusebius, to defend Christianity by citing the judgments of its opponents. Chassay is one of the best-informed of the coterie of writers whom Migne has drawn about him; and this volume attests his ample reading, and also the shrewdness of his understanding. Its citations are confined almost wholly to writers of the present age, theological and scientific; and they are all made to contribute, in some way, to the general design of the book. These remarks will hardly apply to the concluding volume of the series, by the same author, in which he furnishes what he calls the "Infidel Catechism," in which he cites the modern Rationalists and unbelievers, from Rousseau to Strauss and Feuerbach, as involuntary witnesses for Christianity. One of its heads is "Protestantism," which is thus made a branch of Rationalism; and is satisfactorily demolished, according to M. Chassay, by his citations from its own writers.

Praslin, Pascal, Pélisson, Nicole, Boyle, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Locke, Lami, Burnet, Malebranche, Lesley, Leibnitz, La Bruyère, Fénelon, Huet, Clarke, Duguet, Stanhope, Bayle, Leclerc, du Pin, Jacquelot, Tillotson, de Haller, Sherlock, Le Moine, Pope, Leland, Racine, Massillon, Ditton, Derham, d'Aguesseau, de Polignac, Saurin, Buffier, Warburton, Tournemine, Bentley, Littleton, Fabricius, Addison, de Bernis, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Para du Phanjas, Stanislas 1er, Turgot, Stattler, West, Beauzée, Bergier, Gerdil, Thomas, Bonnet, de Crillon, Euler, Delamarre, Caraccioli, Jennings, Duhamel, S. Liguori, Butler, Bullet, Vauvenargues, Guénard, Blair, de Pompignan, Deluc, Porteus, Gérard, Diessbach, Jacques, Lamourette, Laharpe, Le Coz, Duvoisin, de la Luzerne, Schmitt, Poynter, Moore, Silvio Pellico, Lingard, Brunati, Manzoni, Perrone, Paley, Dorléans, Campien, Pérennès, Wiseman, Buckland, Marcel de Serres, Keith, Chalmers, Dupin aîné, Grégoire XVI., Cattet, Milner, Sabatier, Morris, Bolgeni, Chassay, Lombroso et Consoni; contenant les apologies de 117 auteurs, répandues dans 180 volumes, traduites pour la plupart des diverses langues dans lesquelles elles avaient été écrites, reproduites intégralement, non par extraits.

We have still to note a literary enterprise, so vast that an ordinary publishing house would find its hands full in accomplishing it if it attempted nothing else; namely, the three series of Theological Encyclopedias published by the Abbé Migne. His first plan embraced a series of dictionaries, to be completed in fifty-two volumes, entitled "Encyclopédie Théologique," (The Theological Encyclopedia.) The titles of the several dictionaries (topically arranged) are as follows:

Ecriture sainte; Philologie sacrée; Liturgie; Droit canon; Hérésies, Schismes, Livres jansénistes, Propositions et Livres condamnés; Conciles; Cérémonies et rites; Cas de conscience; Ordres religieux (*hommes et femmes;*) diverses Religions; Géographie sacrée et ecclésiastique; Théologie dogmatique, canonique, liturgique, disciplinaire et polémique; Théologie morale, ascétique et mystique; Jurisprudence civile-ecclésiastique; Passions, vertus et vices; Hagiographie; Pèlerinages religieux; Astronomie, physique et météorologie religieuses; Iconographie chrétienne; Chimie et minéralogie religieuses; Diplomatique chrétienne; Sciences occultes; Géologie et chronologie chrétiennes.

The volumes are uniform in size and shape with those of the Patristical series, (imperial 8vo.,) and the set is sold at the marvelously low price of 312 francs, or $1 50 per volume, in paper.

Finding the first encyclopedia to be a success, the Abbé undertook a second, called the "Nouvelle Encyclopédie Théologique," in fifty-three volumes of the same form. It contains:

Dictionnaires de Biographie chrétienne et antichrétienne; des Persécutions; d'Eloquence chrétienne; de Littérature *id.*; de Botanique *id.*; de Statistique *id.*; d'Anecdotes *id.*; d'Archéologie *id.*; d'Héraldique *id.*; de Zoologie; de Médecine pratique; des Croisades; des Erreurs sociales; de Patrologie; des Prophéties et des miracles; des Décrets des Congrégations romaines; des Indulgences; D'Agri-silvi-viti-horticulture; de Musique chrétienne; d'Epigraphie *id.*; de Numismatique *id.*; des Conversions au catholicisme; d'Education; des Inventions et découvertes; d'Ethnographie; des Apologistes involontaires; des Manuscrits; d'Anthropologie; des Mystères; des Merveilles; d'Ascétisme; de Paléographie, de Cryptographie, de Dactylologie, d'Hiéroglyphie, de Sténographie et de Télégraphie; de Paléontologie; de l'Art de verifier les dates; des Confréries; et d'Apologétique chrétienne.

The price is the same as that of the first series, $1 50 a volume.

Not content with these two enormous collections, a third was projected, (now completed with the exception of three volumes,) to take in topics not fully covered by the two first series. It is entitled "Troisiême et dernière Encyclopédie Théologique," and contains,

Dictionnaires de Philosophie catholique; d'Antiphilosophisme; du Parallèle des diverses doctrines religieuses et philosophiques avec la doctrine catholique; du Protestantisme; des Objections populaires contre le catholicisme; de Critique chrétienne; de Scholastique; de Philologie du moyen age; de Physiologie; de Tradition patristique et conciliaire; de la Chaire chrétienne; d'Histoire ecclésiastique; des Missions catholiques; des Antiquités chrétiennes et découvertes modernes; des Bienfaits du christianisme; d'Esthétique chrétienne; de Discipline ecclésiastique; d'Erudition ecclésiastique; des Papes et cardinaux célèbres; de Bibliographie catholique; des Musées religieux et profanes; des Abbayes et monastères célèbres; de Ciselure, gravure et ornamentation chrétienne; de Légendes chrétiennes; de Cantiques chrétiens; d'Economie chrétienne et charitable; des Sciences politiques et sociales; de Législation comparée; de la Sagesse populaire; des Erreurs et superstitions populaires; des Livres apocryphes; de Leçons, en vers, de littérature chrétienne; de Leçons, en prose, de Littérature chrétienne; de Mythologie universelle; et de Technologie universelle.

This series is in sixty volumes, at $1 50 per volume.

The literary merit of the different dictionaries varies greatly. We do not pretend to have examined them all; but we have made use of a sufficient number of them to say, in general terms, that they constitute the least valuable and reliable portion of the Abbé Migne's numerous publications. We give a single specimen from the "Dictionnaire du Protestantisme." Under the article "Methodism," after stating, with some clearness, the rupture between Wesley and the Moravians, the "Dictionnaire" proceeds as follows:

A more cruel trial for Wesley was his dispute with his friend Whitefield on predestination. Wesley held that God had irrevocably fixed, from all eternity, the lot of every individual man, in virtue of his own irresistible will—the pure fanaticism of Calvin. Whitefield, on the other hand, held to the freedom of the human will, which, nevertheless, he pushed to its extreme of Pelagian exaggeration. A large part of the Methodist body agreed with Whitefield; and sought by prayers, reasonings, and even by menaces to recover Wesley from what Whitefield called "the most monstrous error ever engendered in the human mind." All was vain;

and from 1740 onward the Wesleyans and the Whitefieldians stood apart, as had, in the sixteenth century, the Gomarists and the Arminians. Whitefield's final argument was, that the Holy Spirit had personally testified to him the falsity of the doctrine of predestination; but Wesley claimed an equal degree of inspiration for his own desperate system. "Never," said he, "have I read a line of the writings of Calvin; my doctrine is from Christ and his apostles; the Lord has put it into my heart and into my mouth.'"

If Roman Catholic priests get all their notions of Protestant history and theology in this topsy-turvy fashion, it is no wonder that they remain ignorant and superstitious, even when surrounded by all the massive volumes published by the Abbé Migne, which, according to his advertisement cited above, have the merit of exalting the priests' knowledge in the eyes of his parishioners, if they do not furnish his mind with accurate knowledge.

It is only fair to say, that on purely Romanist usages, for example, liturgy, ritual, etc., the dictionaries of this series furnish a large amount of valuable and, no doubt, reliable information.

The department of ecclesiastical history furnishes matter for another extensive work, the "Cours Complet d'Histoire Ecclésiastique," in twenty-five volumes, imperial octavo, at $1 50 a volume. This work was intrusted to the hands of the Baron Henrion, a French lawyer of the old régime, an advocate of absolutism both in politics and religion, and author of many historical works, especially "The History of France," (4 vols., 8vo., 1837–1841; the "History of the Religious Orders," (1835, 2 vols.;) and the "History of Roman Catholic Missions," (1844–47, 2 vols., 8vo.) His "Church History" is a voluminous compilation, in the purely Papal spirit, beginning with the Creation, and going down to the time of Pope Pius IX. Twenty-one volumes have appeared; four yet remain to be published.

The department of Homiletics and Pulpit Eloquence gives room for a still more voluminous series, entitled, "Collection Intégrale et Universelle des Orateurs Chrétiens." The method of the series is chronological, with the aim of presenting, in actual specimens, the history of preaching in France for four centuries. It is comprised in one hundred volumes, imperial

octavo, at five francs, ($1 00) a volume. Two hundred and fifty preachers are represented in the series; and of this number, two hundred, including the great masters, such as Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, etc., are reprinted entire.

Mariolatry is not neglected in the "Catholic Workshops." The "Summa Aurea," in eleven volumes, (imp. 8vo.,) contains a collection of nearly all that Rome has gathered about the Virgin Mary: history, worship, miracles, and all. The third part of the work consists of a collection of treatises on Mariology, or the doctrine of Mary; on the Immaculate Conception, etc. "This work," says the Abbé, in his accompanying advertisement, "is not only the most complete, the most extensive, the most pathetic, and the most authoritative of all that have yet appeared in honor of the Holy Virgin, but it may be said to include all the good literature of the subject. Not, indeed, the books and pamphlets on the topic, unfortunately so numerous, and many of them so worthless, that spring up on all sides like the plagues in Egypt; but all the solid work of councils, popes, fathers, doctors, and great ecclesiastical writers." The good Abbé, it appears, knows how to lay on the whip, on occasion, as well as to use the spur.

Among the minor publications of this great "workshop," (minor, as compared with Migne's larger issues, but large in themselves, for ordinary publishing houses,) is the "Promta Bibliotheca" of Lucius Ferraris, in eight volumes imperial octavo. This work is an encyclopedia of the canon law, ritual, liturgies, etc., of the Roman Catholic Church, and has passed through many editions. We have used, for some time, the Madrid edition of 1795, ten volumes bound in five, folio, which was considered the best before this issue of Migne's, and has always commanded a high price. Brunet, in the new edition of his *Manuel du Libraire*, gives its price at 130 francs, or $26, (gold.) The new edition is sold at 60 francs. It is founded on the Benedictine edition of 1844, and professes to be carefully revised and enlarged, with the addition of copious indexes. The book is thoroughly ultramontane, and has never, therefore, until recently, found favor among the French clergy. Even now, the Abbé tells us, the other nations of Europe order it by dozens, while France takes it only by single copies.

The works of Thomas Aquinas, including the *Summa Theologiæ*, and the *Summa Philosophiæ*, appear in five volumes. Perrone's *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, which, in the ordinary editions, occupies nine volumes, and sells at from nine to fifteen dollars, is republished by Migne in two of his portly volumes at two dollars and a half. The substance of Suarez is given in two volumes; and a summary of the Canon Law also in two. Gesenius's *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, with his *Grammar*, revised, furnishes matter for an enormous volume, which is sold at five dollars. A *Lexicon Manuale Mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis* makes another ponderous volume at three dollars. The works of Saint Theresa, chiefly on Christian Perfection, in the Roman Catholic sense of the term, are issued in four volumes; those of Francis of Sales in six; the devotional works of Boudon in three; the entire works of Bossuet in eleven; those of De La Tour in seven; Baudrand, De Pressy, Le François, De La Chetardie, De Pompignan, two each. Pallavicini's *Council of Trent* is given in three volumes; the complete works of de Bonald in three; Cardinal Luzerne in six; Thiebault in eight; Bergier in eight; the Port Royalists, on the "Perpetuity of the Faith," in four; the Vulgate Bible in two; and the "Ritual" in two; while numerous minor authors appear in a single volume each. It is to be remembered that *all* the volumes are in imperial octavo; the Abbé Migne publishes books in this one form only.

Besides the publication of books, the "Catholic Workshops" are engaged in the manufacture of all the various articles used in Romanist worship. If you want a cathedral organ, the Abbé Migne has one for you at six thousand dollars; if you need a harmonium, he will give you a choice of thirteen sizes, from thirty dollars up to three hundred, in various styles of finish. He has always on hand a quantity of pictures and statues, for the ornamentation of Romanist churches.

The statements given above suffice, as we said in the beginning of this article, to show that the Abbé Migne does not exaggerate, in his published announcement, the extent of his operations or the success of his great enterprise. The means of that success have also, to some extent, transpired in our extracts from his various advertisements; but they deserve to be looked into a little more closely. The first element of success,

in any enterprise, is the personal character of the man that undertakes it. The Abbé clearly possesses rare gifts as a business man. All his programmes and circulars show dexterity and adroitness to a remarkable degree. Our extracts have already illustrated this point; a single additional illustration, and a very characteristic one, may be allowed. It appears that the business was originally started on very small capital; and, in the growth of its operations, there have been periods when loans were needed. The Abbé tells us, in his latest circular, that, whenever he has found himself in need of money for some "great operation," he has naturally had recourse to his brethren in the ministry, and to certain "intelligent and wealthy laymen." He now makes a new appeal, in order to achieve the completion of all his great series of publications:

It may be asked, Why hasten this work of completion? The answer is easy. We wish, in the first place, to put all our readers, clerical and lay, in possession of the complete Courses of Theological Science which we have promised them; and, in the second place, we desire to *rest*, after more than thirty years of continuous labor, in which nothing but the herculean strength of our physical constitution would have enabled us to endure so immense and persistent a strain of our intellectual and bodily faculties. We could go on slowly in our work without a loan. But who knows that our strength will last? who can support perpetual toil without rest or change? and what a public calamity would it be should our task be unhappily left unfinished at last?

The simplicity of this personal confidence is calculated to enlist the sympathy of all who read it. Even the Abbé's obvious appreciation of his own deserts, so naively set forth, tends to impress one with a sense of his honesty of purpose. But he goes on:

We are sure that, now as heretofore, our appeal will not be in vain. Our friends know the nature of our task; and many of them, animated by the sacred fire, are accustomed to large views of duty. But we can add, also, that there is no better "savings bank" for loans than this establishment; under no circumstances—not even a total destruction of our stock by fire—can investments made with us be imperiled. We are fully insured, in twenty different companies. Again, were it necessary for us to close our business, our sheet-stock, sold as waste paper to the grocers, and our stereotype plates, sold as old metal, would more than pay all our debts. Our stereotype plates alone have cost more than a million of dol-

lars; and our volumes in stock are more in number than those of the Imperial library. Add to all this property our book-debts, our presses, tools of all sorts, our Journal, our library, and our immense buildings with the ground on which they stand, all free from mortgage, and you may readily conclude that the man who lends his money to us may sleep with both eyes shut, and have no troubled dreams about the safety of his investment. His security, in a word, is a property worth three million and a half of francs, after all debts are paid; a property which has grown up out of religion, and every penny of which will go back to the service of religion.

We call that a masterpiece. What country curé, with a few hundred dollars saved, would care to invest in the profane public funds, when he has thus a chance to serve the interests of the Church, and at the same time knows that his money is as safe as it would be in the Bank of France?

But the Abbé presents a further claim upon the sympathy and support of his co-religionists. It is his purpose, he tells us, when his life-task is ended, to hand over his establishment to a "Religious Congregation," for the propagation of the faith. His successors, in order to keep up with the demand for solid theological literature, will have nothing to do but select from the stereotype plates those which are needed, and print off the sheets. All the fearful preliminary labor of writing, selecting, editing, and composition, has been done to their hands. After this interjection of higher thoughts and aims, he comes back again skillfully to his money matters:

A thing unheard of in commerce, during our thirty years of business, never, from any accident even, has our paper been protested; our signature remains a virgin one. Morever, see the engagements we take upon ourselves with those who wish to deposit their money with us. 1. We pay all expenses of correspondence and transmission of money. 2. We allow an interest of five per cent. in specie, or of seven per cent. in books taken at choice from our entire stock. For a loan of five years' date, we will deliver in books the entire interest for the whole period, as soon as the money is in our hands.

Perhaps nothing has contributed more to the success of Migne's "Book Concern" than the plan which he has pursued from the beginning, of publishing only books of solid and permanent character, such as are considered necessary for every Roman Catholic library. In his whole list there is hardly a single volume of merely ephemeral interest. More-

over, his greatest work, the *Cursus Patrologiæ*, will find its way into all the great Protestant libraries, as well as Roman Catholic; and the same remark will hold with regard to several others of his weighty books. As a point of detail, but yet one of real importance as an element of success, the uniform size of all the publications of the house is also to be noticed. This has doubtless proved to be a great economy in the working of the establishment; all the presses, forms, etc., in fact all the implements of manufacture both for printing and binding, are of the same size, and can be used for any of the purposes of the workshop without the trouble of discrimination or selection. Moreover, this uniformity of size is a great recommendation to purchasers. Lovers of books are apt to become fastidious as to the appearance of their shelves; and, besides, it is both economical and convenient to have one's shelves of the same width throughout a compartment or division of a library. All workers among books, moreover, desire to have volumes of the same class together on the shelves, and it often happens that, in a careful arrangement, one must put a quarto or an octavo beside a duodecimo.* This has been, undoubtedly, one element of the success of such series as Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclopædia* and Bohn's *Libraries* in general literature, and of Clark's *Library* in theological science.

The last point we shall notice among the causes of the Abbé Migne's success, is the care which he seems to have taken to steer clear of the party strifes within his own Church, and to unite, as far as possible, all parties in support of his undertakings. The internal feuds of the Romanists probably give rise to far more bitterness of feeling than the differences between the various denominations of Protestant Christians. Family quarrels are always the worst. So far as we can judge, the abbé has car-

* This is a great difficulty with librarians. There is a pleasant article in Blackwood, (May, 1867,) entitled, "*How to make a Catalogue of Books*," in which the writer, speaking of a topical arrangement of books on the shelves, remarks, "There are tall books and short books in close proximity. Of the statutes at large, one edition is five inches high, another is two feet. Some of the volumes of Denon's great work on Egypt are about the height of a shortish man; and there is an abridgment of it in octodecimo, which of course must stand by its side. The effect is odd, and certainly not pleasing. It reminds one of the distresses of a martinet commander who could not get his band to "dress." Such uneasiness could we suppose that a man who likes to see his books "range on the shelves" would experience on witnessing this effort at topical arrangement."

ried through, in his capacity of publisher, the motto with which he set out in his early career as newspaper editor, *Catholique, avant tout*, "Catholic, not partisan."

The reader who has followed us thus far can hardly have failed to note the points of likeness between the history of the great publishing house of Migne and that of the Methodist Book Concern in New York, of which an able and thorough historical sketch (by Dr. Porter) appeared in our last number. Migne's success, like that of the Book Concern, shows amply the fallacy of the hasty but often repeated judgment, that clerical control is necessarily ineffective in great enterprises of this character. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find, in the history of the publishing trade, instances of great and permanent growth from small beginnings, to rival the Methodist Book Concern and Migne's Publishing House.

One leaf, we think, our agents might wisely take out of Migne's book, namely, the plan of publishing one series after another of solid theological literature. We do not note this in any spirit of complaint as to what has been done heretofore. The publications of the establishment have generally been timely, and adapted to the current wants of the ministry and laity of the Church. But the last ten years have wrought a great change. Our ministers are largely supplying their libraries with books, both English and American, not of our own production, and not in sympathy with our ecclesiastical and religious position. Our laymen, also, have, with increase of wealth, imbibed a taste for fine books and fine editions. To a certain extent it will always be the case that cultivated men must and will travel beyond any possible lists of books that our own publishing house may put forth. But it is possible, and if we are not mistaken the time has arrived when it will be found easy and safe to enlarge our field. Indeed, an excellent beginning has been already made in the series of commentaries so admirably opened by Dr. Whedon. But why could not our Book Concern issue a series similar to Clark's Library, say four volumes octavo a year, at a subscription price of eight or nine dollars per annum? It may begin with reprints of the soundest Arminian divines of England—say the life and works of John Goodwin; and after a while, a good system might be devised for the preparation of a series of manuals on the

whole field of theological learning, such as our theological schools greatly need, and which might also be adapted to our disciplinary course of study.

It may be necessary for the General Conference to express an opinion on such a development of our publishing enterprise before the agents would feel themselves authorized to undertake it. We throw out the suggestion in time for full consideration before the next session of that body.

Art. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The Ritualistic Controversy.—Official Declarations of the Convocation of Canterbury and York, and of the Irish Bishops—Proceedings of the Ritualistic and Anti-Ritualistic Associations.—The bishops of the Church of England have at length deemed it necessary to take some official action on the ritualistic question, which keeps up a much greater agitation than the Colenso case has ever done. On the thirteenth of February the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury unanimously passed the following resolutions, (the archbishop and thirteen bishops being present:)

Having taken into consideration the report made to this House by the Lower House concerning certain ritual observances, we have concluded that, having regard to the dangers, first, of favoring errors deliberately rejected by the Church of England, and fostering a tendency to desert her communion; second, of offending even in things indifferent devout worshipers in our Churches who have been long used to other modes of service, and thus of estranging many of the faithful laity; third, of unnecessarily departing from uniformity; fourth, of increasing the difficulties which prevent the return of separatists to our communion—we convey to the Lower House our unanimous decision that, having respect to the considerations here recorded, and to the rubric concerning the service of the Church in our Book of Common Prayer, our judgment is that no alterations from long-sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our Churches until the sanction of the bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.

When the judgment of the bishops was sent down to the Lower House it gave rise to a good deal of discussion, and a number of amendments were offered, all of which, however, were finally withdrawn in favor of an amendment moved by Dr. Leighton, that the House should concur in the judgment of the Upper House, leaving the reasons given by the bishops out of the question. This was carried, and conveyed by the prolocutor to the Upper House, as the opinion of the Lower. A few days after the meeting of the convocation of Canterbury, (Feb. 19,) the Archbishop of Canterbury, in reply to a deputation from the National Club, had expressed himself very strongly against the tendency of the Ritualists, saying that he found it impossible to evade the conviction that among those who were joining in the present movement for the restoration of eucharistic vestments, the use of the incense, and candles lighted in the day-time, the offering of the holy sacrament as a propitiatory sacrifice, and the elevation of the consecrated elements for the worship of the people, there were many who were resolved, if possible, to obliterate in the formularies and worship of the Church of England every trace of the Reformation.

In the Convocation of the province of York, on the 20th of March, the following resolutions were proposed by Canon Hey, and seconded by the Dean of Ripon:

Whereas certain vestments and ritual observances have recently been intro-

duced into the services of the Church of England, this House desires to place on record its deliberate opinion that these innovations are to be deprecated, as tending to favor errors rejected by that Church, and as being repugnant to the feelings of a large number both of the laity and clergy. And this House is further of opinion that it is desirable that the minister, in public prayer and the administration of the sacraments and other rites of the Church, should continue to use the surplice, academical hood, or tippet for non-graduate, and the scarf or stole; these having received the sanction of long-continued usage.

The resolution was adopted in the Lower House by twenty-three to seven votes, and unanimously concurred in by the Upper House.

The archbishops and bishops of Ireland, in reply to an address from a committee of laymen on the subject of ritualistic innovations, unanimously signed a reply in which they say, "That it is the right and duty of the laity of the Church to take a lively interest in the maintenance of the sound doctrine and the pure worship which were restored to it by the Reformation, and that the exertions of the bishops in defense of these inestimable blessings, if they were at any time endangered, would mainly depend for success, under God, upon the cordial co-operation of their lay as well as clerical brethren. They were able to say, each for his diocese, that within their knowledge no cases of excessive ritual existed in this part of the United Church; but if it should be otherwise, they were fully prepared to use all their authority and influence to discourage and resist all changes in the manner of performing divine service which are contrary to the spirit of the Reformed Church of England."

The Ritualists have not been intimidated by these Episcopal declarations. The English Church Union, the principal society of the Ritualists, in their first meeting after the passage of the resolutions in the Convocation of Canterbury, adopted a report on the present aspect of the question, which set forth the circumstances under which the resolutions were passed, and entered very fully into the arguments connected with them. It concluded by recommending the adoption of a series of resolutions, the last of which stated that the Union fully trusted that a cautious adherence to lawful ritual, and a careful avoidance of needless causes for unjust imputations, will in time lead the English mind to perceive that the fears which the Upper House had expressed had no real foundation. The Rev. Dr. Pusey, in moving the adoption of the report, said he had no doubt the first two resolutions expressed the distinct meaning of the bishops. The real objective presence we learned in the Catechism, and drank it in in our devotions, and it was utterly inconceivable that the bishops could speak of it as rejected by the Church of England. So long as the Prayer-Book remains as it is, so long will all these things remain in the Church of England. The Nonconformists see this very well, and if it were pointed out to them our people would see it too. They say the Prayer of Consecration itself would be a mockery unless it were meant to express the Real Presence, and therefore nothing will content those who make this attack but giving up the Prayer-Book. And thus there are but two ways of meeting them—either to resist them, or to split the Church of England to pieces.

The greatest efforts for counteracting the schemes of the Ritualists are made by the "Church Association," an association organized for this sole object in 1866. It recently held its second annual meeting, when the following resolutions were adopted:

That this meeting deprecates in the strongest terms the unchecked continuance by clergymen in the Church of England of practices and teaching utterly at variance with the principles of the Reformation, and, as it believes, contrary to the law of the Church as at present existing; and pledges itself to continue all constitutional means whereby the grievances complained of may be remedied, and the efforts to obtain redress on the part of those who are driven in consequence from their parish churches may be encouraged and supported. That this meeting, fully convinced that by united action alone the widespread conspiracy to subvert the principles of the Protestant Reformed Church can be resisted, strongly recommends the Church Association to all the loyal members of that Church as an institution, in its principles and organization, whereby such united action may be effectively carried out, and therefore as deserving their cordial support.

The association has also issued a formal address to the Church of England, in which they state that the

council of the association have had for some time under their consideration four plans designed to arrest the progress of Ritualism.

1. To ascertain and vindicate the law of the Church by a prosecution for practices considered illegal. 2. To strengthen the law of the Church by an enactment directed against the most obnoxious practices of Ritualism. 3. To enlarge the power of the bishops, and give them a discretionary jurisdiction to regulate the performance of public worship. 4. To refer the whole questions to a Royal Commission. On the first point, they state that they have been assisting parties in certain cases. On the second point, they think no measure would be likely to find favor with the House of Commons. On the third point, they remark that the result might either be such a struggle of opinions within the Commission that no report would be possible, or else a compromise satisfactory to none. The council, therefore, urge those who are now moving for a commission to pause, at least for a short time, till the success of direct legislation has been put to the test. Under the fourth head they allude to Lord Shaftesbury's bill, declaring the use of Romanizing vestments illegal, and the Council recommends the bill to the support of the country.

CONVOCATION OF A GENERAL ANGLICAN COUNCIL, CONSISTING OF ENGLISH, SCOTCH, IRISH, AMERICAN, COLONIAL, AND MISSIONARY BISHOPS.—One of the most important events in the modern, and perhaps in the whole history of the Anglican Churches, is the invitation issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury to all the bishops of the Established Church of England and Ireland, the bishops of the English colonies, the missionary bishops in connection with the Church of England, the bishops of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to meet in general council, on September 14, at his residence, Lambeth. The occasion for this important movement is fully set forth in the letter of invitation, which we give in full as a most important contribution to the ecclesiastical history of our age.

LAMBETH PALACE, *Feb.* 22, 1867.

"RT. REV. AND DEAR BROTHER: I request your presence at a meeting of the bishops in visible communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, purposed, God willing, to be holden at Lambeth, under my presidency, on the 24th of September next and the three following days.

"The circumstances under which I have resolved to issue the present invitations are these: The Metropolitan and bishops of Canada last year addressed to the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury the expression of their desire that I should be moved to invite the bishops of our Indian and Colonial Episcopate to meet myself and the home bishops for brotherly communion and conference.

"The consequence of that appeal has been, that both Houses of the Convocation of my province have addressed to me their dutiful request that I would invite the attendance, not only of our own home and colonial bishops, but of all who are avowedly in communion with our Church. The same request was unanimously preferred to me at a numerous gathering of English, Irish, and colonial archbishops and bishops recently assembled at Lambeth, at which—I rejoice to record it—we had the counsel and concurrence of the eminent bishop of the Church in the United States of America, the Bishop of Illinois.

Moved by these requests, and by the expressed concurrence therein of other members both of the home and colonial Episcopate who could not be present at our meeting, I have now resolved—not, I humbly trust, without the guidance of God the Holy Ghost—to grant this grave request, and call together the meeting thus earnestly desired. I greatly hope that you may be able to attend it, and to aid us with your presence and brotherly counsel thereat.

I propose that, at our assembling, we should first solemnly seek the blessing of Almighty God on our gathering, by uniting together in the highest acts of the Church's worship. After this brotherly consultations will follow. In these we may consider, together, many practical questions, the settlement of which would tend to the advancement of the Kingdom of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, and to the maintenance of greater union in our missionary work, and to increased intercommunion among ourselves.

Such a meeting would not be competent to make declarations, or lay down definitions, on points of doctrine. But united worship and common counsels would greatly tend to maintain practically the unity of the faith; while they would bind us in straiter bonds of peace and brotherly charity.

I shall gladly receive from you a list

of any subjects you may wish to suggest to me for consideration and discussion. Should you be unable to attend, and desire to commission any brother bishop to speak for you, I shall welcome him as your representative in our united deliberations.

But I must once more express my earnest hope that on this solemn occasion I may have the great advantage of your personal presence.

And now I commend this proposed meeting to your fervent prayers; and, humbly beseeching the blessing of Almighty God on yourself and your diocese, I subscribe myself your faithful brother in the Lord, C. T. CANTUAR.

CHINA.

STATISTICS OF THE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES AND THE MISSIONARY STATIONS.—Full statistical information on the present condition of the Protestant missions in China is given in the "Directory of Protestant Missions in China, June 15, 1866," issued from the American Methodist Episcopal mission press at Foochow, China. The following are the statistics of the stations:

	Missionaries.	Helpers.	Rec'd in 1865.	Members.
Canton	24	28	34	228
Hongkong	25	22	104	558
Swatow	8	13	30	152
Amoy	16	41	94	892
Takao	1	1	..	...
Foochow	22	24	42	224
Ningpo	32	42	141	656
Shanghai	19	7	22	242
Hankow	6	5	4	40
Kinkiang	1	..	..	...
Chefoo	7	4	5	17
Tungchow	9	4	5	41
Tientsin	11	5	3	29
Peking	21	10	24	63
Kalgan	2	..	..	...

The following are the statistics of the various societies:

	Members.
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Canton, Foochow, Tientsin, Peking, Kalgan)	83
" Bapt. Miss. Union (Swato, Ningpo)	235
" Methodist Episc. Church, South (Shanghai)	20
" Meth. Episc. Mission (Foochow)	148
" Protestant Episc. Mission (Shanghai, Peking)	69
" Presbyterian Mission (Peking, Tungchow, Canton, Ningpo, Shanghai, Chefoo)	307
" Reformed Dutch Mission (Amoy)	347
" Southern Bapt. Convention (Canton, Shanghai, Tungchow)	143
American United Presbyt. Mission (Canton)	..
British and Foreign Bible Society (Shanghai)	..
Berlin Ladies' Societies (Hongkong)	..
Chinese Evangelization Society (English) Ningpo	59
Chinese Evangel. Society of Berlin (Hongkong)	143
Church Mission Society (Hongkong, Foochow, Ningpo, Peking)	214
Engl. Baptist Mission (Chefoo)	14
Engl. Meth. New Conn. (Tientsin.)	15
Evang. Miss. Soc. of Basel (Hongkong)	200
Engl. Presbyt. Mission, (Swatow, Amoy, Takao, Peking)	278
Engl. United Meth. Free Churches (Ningpo)	..
English Wesleyan Mission (Canton, Kinkiang, Hankow)	46
Hongkong Diocesan Female School (Hongkong)	..
London Miss. Society (Canton, Hongkong, Amoy, Shanghai, Hankow, Tientsin, Peking)	672
National Bible Society of Scotland (Peking)	..
Rhenish Miss. Society (Hongkong)	100
Society for Promoting Female Education in the East (Hongkong)	..
United Presbyt. Church of Scotland (Ningpo)	49
Independent	..

Altogether there were in China in 1866, 97 ordained missionaries, 14 lay missionaries, 93 missionary ladies, (whole number of missionaries 204,) 206 native helpers. In 1865, 282 members were received into the Christian Churches, and the total number of native members was 3,142. The largest number of Christians are at Amoy, (892,) after which follow, Ningpo, (656,) Hongkong, (558,) Shanghai, (242,) Canton, (228,) Foochow, (224.) Among the societies the London Missionary has the largest congregations, together with 672 members. The prospects of Christianity in China have greatly improved in consequence of the treaties which, in 1858, were concluded with the great Christian nations, and, after the attempt of the Chinese to evade the execution, had led to a several years' war, were ratified in 1861. These treaties not only establish full religious toleration, but they expressly state that the principles and practices of Christianity tend to benefit mankind. Thus Article 13 of the French treaty says: "The Christian religion, having for its essential object to lead men to virtue, the members of all Christian bodies,

(communions,) shall enjoy full security for their persons, their property, and the free exercise of their religious worship; and entire protection shall be given to missionaries who peacefully enter the country furnished with passports such as are described in article eight. No obstacles shall be interposed by the Chinese authorities to the recognized right of any person in China to embrace Christianity, if he pleases, and to obey its requirements without being subject on that account to any penalty. Whatever has been heretofore written, proclaimed, or published in China, by order of government, against the Christian faith, is wholly abrogated and nullified in all the provinces of the empire." Since then, the preaching of Christianity has not been again seriously interfered with. Missionaries have traveled as far as four hundred miles into the interior and publicly proclaimed the Gospel to the assembled crowds of people, freely distributing Christian books without the least opposition from the authorities. The capital (Peking) itself has been occupied as a station by several missionary societies, and England, the United States, France, Spain, and Russia have embassadors there who watch over the interests of the several Christian Churches. During the last months very encouraging information has been received from several of the missionary stations. One of the most remarkable awakenings that is known in the whole history of Protestantism of China took place in 1866 in connection with the out-stations of the Tientsin mission of the English New Connection Methodists, especially at Lou-Leing, where in September forty-five persons were admitted to baptism. The converts added to the mission churches of the London society in Shanghai and the province of which it forms the capital, numbered during the year 1866 one hundred and eighty-nine. Together with the number of native members, the number of Christian institutions steadily increases. Thus the London Missionary Society has established in the populous city of Hankow a hospital, with which will be connected a hall where the Gospel will be preached daily.

An event of considerable importance for the Protestant missions of China is the establishment of a monthly religious paper in the English language (the "Missionary Recorder") by the missionaries of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Foochow.

The English Presbyterian Mission at Takao, upon the island of Formosa, which was established in 1865, and which in the above list still appears without Church members, is becoming one of great importance. The missionary is aided by three converted Chinese. Four male converts have lately been united in Church fellowship, one of whom belongs to the Petaou city, where it is hoped he may be the means of carrying the Gospel. The island of Formosa, in Chinese called Taioan, is two hundred and sixty miles long, and at least seventy-five miles wide. Takao, the seat of the English Presbyterian mission, is situated on the western side of the island, and has from two thousand to three thousand inhabitants, but south and north there are wide tracts of country. Eight miles distant is the district of the city of Pe-taou, comprising a population of from ten thousand to twelve thousand persons.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.*

Among the many excellent cyclopedic works which Protestant Germany has produced, the "Cyclopedia of Instruction and Education," by Dr. Schmidt, of Stuttgardt, deserves an honorable mention: (*Encyclopædie des gesammten Erzielungs und Unterrichtswesens.* Gotha, 1859 *sq.*) The editor in chief is assisted by Dr. Palmer, one of the ablest German writers of educational affairs, and many other authors, clergymen, and teachers. The work embraces the whole province of pedagogics and all its auxiliary sciences, inclusive of the history of

* Most of the books noticed below can be found on hand, and all can be obtained, at the bookstore of Louis W. Schmidt, 24 Barclay-street, New York.

pedagogics, and very complete statistical information. It abounds in able biographies of men distinguished as teachers, or writers, or educators, and gives very interesting and full accounts of the educational systems and institutions of America, England, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Portugal, Austria, and Prussia, and every other country. To all teachers, and all friends of education, this work can be cordially recommended.

A new contribution to apologetic literature is given in Kritzler's *Humanität und Christenthum.* (*Civilization and Christianity.* Vol. I. Wiesbaden, 1866.) The author compares the fundamental views of biblical Christianity with the objections made by modern Materialism and Pantheism, and in a popular and brilliant style undertakes the defense of the former. The first volume contains fourteen chapters, which, among other subjects, treat of the relation of civilization to Christianity, on views of modern civilization, on Christian civilization, on grace, miracles, and power, on mystery and revelation, on the God-man, on the incarnation of the God-man. The work is highly recommended in the theological papers of Germany.

The year-book of the Gustavus Adolphus Association, (*Jahrbuch des Gustav-Adolf-Vereins*, Elberfeld,) of which the third volume was published in 1866, contains much interesting information on the progress of Protestantism, and in particular, on the operations of the Gustavus Adolphus Association. The volume for 1866 contains elaborate articles on the Lutheran Church in Russia, on the Gospel in Constantinople, and on the ecclesiastical condition of Sweden.

Dr. Baltzer (Prof. of Rom. Cath. Theology at the University of Breslau) has begun the publication of an elaborate work on the harmony between the biblical account of creation and the results of modern science. (*Die Biblische Schöpfungs-Geschichte*, etc. Leipzig, 1867. First volume.)

Information on the Lutheran congregations of Bohemia, Moravia, and the Slavic districts of Hungary is given in Dr. Wangemann's "Travels through a part of Bohemia, Moravia, and the country of the Slovacks," (*Reise*, etc. Berlin, 1866.) Bohemia has nineteen Lutheran congregations; Moravia thirteen. The latter are divided into two seniorats, Brunn, (four congregations,) and Zauchtelen, (nine congregations,) together twenty thousand souls. The Slavic Lutherans in Hungary have recently attracted some attention by their conflicts with the Magyars, charging the national party of Hungary with a desire to deprive them of their Slavic language as well as of their (High Church) Lutheran character. The author is at the head of a High Church Lutheran Society, which supports feeble Lutheran congregations abroad.

From the ninth annual report of the Berlin Association for Evangelical Missions in China, (*Neunter Bericht des Berliner Hauptvereins*, Berlin, 1864), we learn that this special Chinese missionary society supports one missionary in China, that during the last thirty months ninety persons were baptized, and that seventy pagan schools, with one thousand one hundred and sixty-nine scholars, are under the superintendence of the missionary.

The first volume of an extensive monograph on Patriarch Photius of Constantinople has been published by Professor Hergenröther, of Wurzburg, (*Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel. Sein Leben seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma.* Vol. I. Ratisbon, 1867.) The author is Professor of Roman Catholic Theology at the University of Wurzburg, and, from his former works on Church history, it may be expected that the subject will be treated from the standpoint of a strict and uncompromising Roman Catholic. At the same time the thorough acquaintance of the author with the history of the Greek Church, and with the history of Photius in particular, warrants an expectation that the work, however partial, will deserve the attention of Protestant theologians. Hergenröther has previously published a heretofore inedited work of Photius. (*Liber de Spiritus S. Mystagogia.* Ratisbon, 1858; and 21 Amphilochiæ in Migne's edition of Photius: Paris, 1860.) His work on the life and writings of Photius will embrace three large volumes, and be divided into ten books. The first is devoted to the time before Photius; the following six books treat of the life of Photius. The eighth gives an account of his writings, the ninth discusses his theology, and the tenth is devoted to

the time after Photius, in order to show "how far his influence extended upon later times, how the weapons first furnished by him were subsequently used in the contest with the Latin Church, and how the schism begun by him became a permanent fact."

A very interesting contribution to the History of Christian Doctrines has been furnished by a work of Professor Caspari, of the University of Christiana, in Norway, entitled "Inedited Sources for the History of the Baptismal Symbol and the Rule of Faith." (*Ungedruckte Quellen zur geschichte des Saufsymbols und der Glaubensregel.* Vol. I. Christiana, 1866.) It contains two documents ascribed to Athanase, a fragment of the Antiochene Baptismal Confession from the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, a Syriac translation of the Nicene and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creeds, the Baptismal Confessions of the Nestorians, a confession of faith of Bishop John of Jerusalem.

One of the most important works on the foreign missions of the Protestant Churches which has appeared in this part of theological literature is the "Universal Missionary Atlas," by Dr. R. Grundemann, (*Algemeiner Missions Atlas.* Gotha, 1867.) It will consist of four parts, namely, 1. Africa, (twenty maps.) 2. Asia, inclusive of Turkey, (twenty-seven maps.) 3. Australia and Polynesia, (sixteen maps.) 4. America, (fifteen maps.) The first part, embracing Africa, will be published in three divisions, the first of which will contain eight, the second seven, and the third five maps. On each of the maps the stations of every particular society are marked by a special color. To each map is added two pages of text giving a geographical and historical description of the country, a brief outline of its missionary history, and the present statistics.

"Contributions to Christian Knowledge" (*Beiträge zur Christlichen Erkenntniss*, Basel, 1865) is a collection of essays and sermons from the late Dr. Auberlen, one of the ablest apologetic writers of Protestant Germany. The longest essay (occupying about one half of the volume,) is on faith, which belongs among the best theological productions of Auberlen.

Edouard Boehmer has written a very valuable and interesting work on two pioneers of Protestantism in Spain. (*Francisca Hernandez*, and *Frai Francesco Ortez.* Leipzig, 1865.) The information here given is mostly new, being derived from manuscripts which a German scholar, Dr. Gotthold Heine, obtained during a journey in Spain.

Among the strictly theological periodicals of Germany, a quarterly devoted exclusively to homiletics, and edited by E. Ohly, well deserves a cordial recommendation. Every number contains an elaborate treatise on a homiletical question, several sketches of sermons for each of the thirteen Sundays of the quarter, some religious poetry, and a full list of new theological books of Germany. (*Mancherlei Gaben und ein Geist. Homilet. Vierteljahreschrift.* Vol. V. Wiesbaden, 1866.)

Another quarterly, published by Dr. Heidenheim, pays special attention to the theological publications of the English literature. It contains many valuable articles on Oriental literature. (*Vierteljahreschrift für deutsch- und englishtheologische Forschung.* Zurich, 1866.)

A very interesting contribution to the literature on the great Reformation of the sixteenth century is Dr. Burkhardt's "Correspondence of Dr. Luther." (*Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel.* Leipzic, 1866.) It contains more than three hundred letters of the great Reformer which have not been published before, and is therefore a valuable supplement to all previous collections.

The well-known manual of Church history by Dr. Hase (translated into English by Dr. Wing and Prof. Blumenthal) has appeared in an eighth edition, thoroughly revised, completed by the addition of the latest literature, and continued up to the present day. The work still maintains its reputation as one of the best of the kind in the whole of Protestant literature. (*Kirchengeschichte.* Leipzig, 1867.) A new manual of the most recent Church history has been published by Dr. F. Nippold, *Privat-docent* of theology at the University of Heidelberg. (*Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte.* Elberfeld, 1867.) It is introduced by a preface from Dr. Rothe.

Of the works by Bishop Raess, of Strasburg, on the lives and works of those who since the Reformation have gone over from one of the Protestant

denominations to the Church of Rome, three volumes have thus far appeared, reaching to the year 1601. (*Die Convertirten.* Freiburg, 1866, sq.) The work will comprise about twelve volumes.

Among the Roman Catholic works announced as soon forthcoming, we find the sixth volume of Hefele's History of Councils.

FRANCE.

Of the new edition of the first fifty-four volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, the largest work on the saints of the Church of Rome, which is being published at Paris by Jean Oarnandet, twenty volumes have thus far appeared. (Vols. 1–12, 14–18, 46–48.) Every volume costs about twelve dollars, and every year ten volumes are published.

Art. IX.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review, April, 1867.—1. Historical Evidence as Affected by Time. 2. Hodgson on Time and Space. 3. Irenæus and Infant Baptism. 4. The Divine Names in the Hebrew Scriptures. 5. The Greetings of Paul. 6. Our Public Schools.

Baptist Quarterly, April, 1867. (Philadelphia.) — 1. Rebaptism. 2. Meaning of the Word κτίσις in Romans viii, 19–23. 3. The Apostle Paul. 4. The Scriptural Anthropology. 5. The Fundamental Law of Christian Worship. 6. Open Communion.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, April, 1867. (Philadelphia.)—1. Western Presbyterianism. 2. The Epicurean Philosophy. 3. Emanuel Swedenborg. 4. The Position of the Book of Psalms in the Plan of the Old Testament. 5. The Philosophy of Mathematics.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, April, 1867. (Gettysburg.)—1. The Relation of the Sermon to the Church Year. 2. Church Discipline. 3. Daniel's Seventy Weeks. 4. The Millennium. Revelation of John, chap. xx. 5. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. 6. The Evidences of a Future State, as seen in the Analogies of Nature. 7. Theological Inquiry. 8. The Authorship of the Augsburg Confession. 9. Prayer. 10. How God Concurs in the Wicked Deeds of Men.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, April, 1867. (Dover, N. H.)—1. Sketches of Egypt. 2. Pioneer Free Baptist Ministers in Wisconsin. 3. The Spirit and Mission of the Scholar. 4. Life of Moses. 5. Life and Death Eternal. 6. The Conversion of Children. 7. The Shilohic Fullness of Time. 8. A Day at the Ruins of Baalbec.

New Englander, April, 1867. (New Haven.)—1. Present Condition and Prospects of Unitarianism. 2. Divorce. Part II.—Doctrine of Divorce in the New Testament. 3. Church Communion by Council. 4. Ward's Life of Percival. 5. Thoughts on Public Worship. 6. The Late Rev. Dr. Dutton.

Universalist Quarterly, April, 1867. (Boston.)—1. Knowledge as an Instrument, an Ornament, and a Blessing. 2. The Possibility of Universal Salvation. 3. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ. 4. The Catacombs of Rome. 5. The Eternal Logos. 6. Longevity of the Antediluvians.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1867. (Boston.)—1. Modern Italian Poets. 2. British Finance in 1816. 3. Charles Lamb and his Biographers. 4. The New Jersey Monopolies. 5. The Railroad System. 6. Deaf-Mute Education. 7. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. 8. Lessing. 9. Religious Liberty.

The old North American is the patriarch, and has hitherto been the prince of American Quarterlies. In our boyhood and college life we accepted it, as we accepted the firmament, as of the established and natural system of things, an authority not to be criticised, but assumed as the standard of departure for criticism upon all other parts of the system. The graceful and liberal culture of Everett, Sparks, and Peabody, and the candid and cautious respect they maintained for religious institutes in which they did not coincide, rendered it possible for all sects and sections to accept it as a common literary representative. For the last four or five years, at least, its visits to our table, as an exchange, have, for reasons to us unknown, been suspended until the present number. During that interval it has passed into new editorial hands, and some important changes have been made. From the *officina* of Ticknor & Fields, it comes in statelier external style than ever. Its articles are marked with the same ability, and perhaps an increased point and trenchancy. In the present number the article on the New Jersey Monopoly takes rank, in its powerful exposure of existing abuse, with Parton's article on New York misgovernment. The article on the Railroad System will powerfully contribute to bring before the public mind the fact that corporate monopoly is the next great danger and despotism with which the nation must wage a desperate war. The literary articles on the Italian Poets, and on Longfellow, are in the best style of the old North.

But there are two articles by the editors which painfully assure us that the religious position of the North American is essentially changed. It abdicates the position of a national literary representative, and becomes the organ of a *sect*, or rather *set*. Precisely as the Boston Review is the organ of Old School Presbyterianism and ours of Methodism, *the North American is the trenchant and aggressive organ of outspoken skepticism*. The indecent Tom Paineism of these two articles is unmistakable. We question not the sincerity of the writers' views, nor their right to make the Review the means of their expression after the public are fairly warned what to expect; we only claim to pronounce the character of those views, and to hold the writers and the Review responsible for them. They have a right to assail Christianity, but they have no right to claim to be her literary representative. They

are welcome to insult the Christian Church and her ministry but they must allow us the right to warn every Christian gentleman in our land that every dollar he pays to sustain this Review is a contribution to the cause of infidelity.

The first of these two articles is a eulogy upon Lessing, an original prime mover in the inauguration of the infidel apostasy of Germany. Mr. Lowell is pleased to say:

> At present the world has advanced to where Lessing stood, while the Church has done its best to stand stock-still; and it would be a curious, were it not a melancholy spectacle, to see the indifference with which the laity look on while theologians thrash their wheatless straw, utterly unconscious that there is no longer any common term possible that could bring their creeds again to any point of bearing on the practical life of men. Fielding never made a profounder stroke of satire than in Squire Western's indignant "Art not in the pulpit now! When art got up there, I never mind what dost say."

Let it be noted that this profound "stroke" is quoted by Lowell from an obscene English novel, "Tom Jones," written by a debauched London rowdy in his own proper spirit, and the reader will say that while it demonstrates the elevated purity of the pulpit that such depraved beings should hate and revile it, the man who genially quotes it not only plasters a nastiness upon the once fair page, but grades himself at the level of the original rowdy. Upon that "flat Bedford level" we leave Mr. James Russell Lowell.

Mr. Norton, the writer of the other of the two articles, does not possess the capacity for much mischief. His essay on Religious Liberty is a piece of the ordinary commonplace of his set. All opinions, he opines, are religiously of equally indifferent value. Even Atheism is as religious as any other creed. Then we have a plentiful sprinkle of the ordinary braggartisms and cant phrases of the set. We have "traditional theology," "old churches," "irrational dogmas;" and the stereotype boasts that the Christian system is to be now abolished in the true spirit of Voltaire's old "Ecraser l'infame." Mr. Norton of course reiterates the old mendacious gist that his views, even the making religion atheistically ignore a God, are the true religion of Jesus; just as Hume closes his Essay on Miracles with the irony that he is seeking to base Christianity on firmer principles than those of the "pretended Christians" he is refuting. Mr. Norton says this, but he does not himself believe it. He is aware of the fiction he utters. To Mr. Norton and his like, who seek to baptize Atheism into the name of the blessed Jesus, His divine reply is, "I know God, and if I should say I know him not, I should be *a liar like unto you;*" and there is a terrible record of prophecy that that same Jesus will one day reappear, "taking vengeance on all those *that know not God* and obey not the gospel

of his Son." Such is the Christianity of Jesus and his apostles; let Mr. Norton and his set study it with silent meditation.

The great evangelic Church of our present day, based upon the Old Testament and the New, successor of the prophets, apostles, and martyrs, the Church of the Trinity, the Atonement, and the Regeneration, stands at this moment refreshed with revival and the gift of the Spirit, exerting an aggressive power unparalleled since the Pentecostal day. Never was the spirit of holiness more intense within her heart, never her love for her precious central TRUTHS more vital, never her plans of world-wide conquest so bold and so sure, never were her machineries so vast. Behold her centenaries dowered with outpoured millions; and count her laymen rearing in massive granite her biblical institutes, for the very purpose, mark it well, of teaching *forever* the theology of James Arminius and John Chrysostom. While at home she is battling with vice and error in every form, dealing death-blows upon slavery, drunkenness, profanity, and infidelity, planting her spires on every hill and plain of all our land, she is distributing her Bibles by increasing millions to all the languages of our race, and commissioning her missionaries to every land of the habitable globe. And while these stupendous plans for human renovation are going forth in rapid progress, two silly gentlemen in or about Boston, heirs in regular line to the Porphyrys, Lessings, and Tom Paines, are still scribbling essays about the obsoleteness of the Church and the destruction of Christianity! Truly they are not the first fools who have mistaken the cant of their own clique for the opinion of the world, nor imagined their own little horizon to coincide with the circumference of creation.

We conclude by promptly and firmly performing our duty in declaring that the old North American Review has fallen into very bad hands, and in its present position, whatever its claims upon the merely literary class, is unworthy the countenance of the distinctively Christian public. If James Russell Lowell feels it to be his mission to assail the Christian faith and the Christian Church; if the North American Review chooses to place itself at the head of the infidel press of our country; they must abdicate their position, the former as an unquestioned classic in American literature, the latter as the representative head of the American periodical press.

SOUTHERN REVIEW, April, 1867. Baltimore.—1. The Origin of the Late War. 2. Southern War Poetry. 3. The Teaching and the Study of Geometry. 4. De Tocqueville on the Sovereignty of the People. 5. The Legend of Venus. 6. Recent Histories of Julius Cæsar.

7. Life, Character, and Works of Henry Reed. 8. Agricultural Chemistry. 9. Victor Hugo as a Novelist. 10. The New America of Mr. Dixon.

The first article (written, we doubt not, by the editor) discusses and decides *the true cause of our great civil war.* Five different opinions are enumerated; and the fifth, which specifies *slavery* as the cause, is pronounced to be "the most superficial of all." On the contrary "the antagonism between the North and the South, so imperfectly adjusted by the labors of 1787, is the true standpoint from which to contemplate the origin of the late war." The whole theory is, therefore, that a natural, or at least permanent antagonism exists between the two sections, *as* North and South, that it was imperfectly adjusted by the Constitution, and that it underlay and took into itself all other causes in our late war; and the inference is obviously left uncontradicted, as we understand him, that it still and for ever survives for future contest.

We think this to be a very untrue and a very dangerous doctrine. We think it *untrue;* for there is no more proof of and no more reason for hostile antagonism between our North and South than between the British North and South, known as Scotland and England. All countries have a north and south; and they have also an east and west. The actual historical fact is, that it was *a purpose to create and to use this sectional issue* entertained by a knot of leaders—a purpose which no constitutional arrangement could obviate—which made the North and South a basis of contest. The alternative held forth by those sectional leaders to the North was *the supremacy of slavery or disunion!* The North most justly determined to accept neither. The war and the destruction of slavery are the condign result.

The doctrine, we think, is *dangerous*, for it is pregnant with future war. The propagation of the doctrine of an inherent sectional antagonism creates the antagonism. When a body of influential men base their own interest, fame, or fortune upon a sectional issue, they make it their life's business to create the feeling and establish the antagonism. The entire lessons of the past warn the leaders, both intellectual and political, of the South (as well as North) to beware of laying any further sectional platforms, or attempting to create any future sectional animosities. Without such efforts they would never hereafter exist.

We have ever affirmed that the true antislavery man is no sectional man. *We* never hated the South. We never assailed slavery, or anything else, because it was Southern. Had slavery been, like intemperance, a universally diffused wickedness, we

should have assailed it from whatever vantage ground it allowed us, in whatever intrenchment we found it. Our first battle with it was in the North and with the North, and we expect that our next moral battle will be with some Northern or national wickedness. We have ever entertained a more indulgent feeling for the southern-born slaveholder than for the northern supporter of black laws and negro disfranchisements. We attacked not a section, but an institution. We hated not the South, but slavery. We promptly take rank, however, with that "superficial" class who maintain that the true cause of the late war *was* slavery. That a few southern autocrats (who, as Edward Everett once said, "could be counted upon your fingers") used the slavery interest merely as a means for the establishment of a new empire for self-aggrandizement we, indeed, freely concede. But that slavery was the one great, efficient, indispensable *cause*, is as undeniable as that gravitation holds our marble structures to the earth. It was not because the writer of these lines was an anti-states-rights man, or because he was a Northerner, that for fifteen years his life would not have been safe in the South; but because he could colorably be styled "an abolitionist!" For thirty years the slavery question has been the one topic; the establishment or overthrow of slavery the one object of struggle; and all constitutional questions have been subordinate and instrumental. During that time, ninety-nine in a hundred of the issues made by the South against the North, in speeches, editorials, threats of disunion, and measures of hostility, have assumed the antislavery discussion as their ground. Yet we may, nevertheless, not regret that our Southern friends now repudiate slavery as the object of *their* struggle. We believe that when the defense of slavery becomes obsolete, sectional appeals and issues will disappear. We have heard intelligent Southerners express surprise that they find no hostile prejudice, no bitter feeling toward themselves, personally, as Southerners, anywhere in the North, not even in New England. We hope to live to see the time when the terms North and South shall sound as little antagonistic as East and West. We wish we could see some token in the Southern Quarterly of a similar wish.

We regret to note the omission also, in both numbers of this noble Quarterly, of all effort at pointing the South to the great work of developing her unrivaled resources, and building a future prosperity for which she has a world of means, far surpassing those of the North, on the solid basis of material value. We have the old error of Virginia abstractionism all over again; an absorption in political metaphysics, with an oblivion of all the means and

measures for the solid prosperity of the South. If Dr. Bledsoe would think less of sectionalizing, and more of tranquilizing, liberalizing, loyalizing, and nationalizing the South; if his Quarterly would deal less in metaphysics and more in physics; if he would discuss fewer political topics, and give an inspiration, a lead, and a guidance to the industrial, agricultural, and commercial enterprise of the South, he might, we trust, yet live to be the benefactor of his country.

English Reviews.

British Quarterly Review, April, 1867. (London.)—1. Ferdinand Christian von Baur. 2. Charles Lamb. 3. Banking Reform. 4. Church Buttresses. 5. Mrs. Gaskell. 6. Nichol's Puritan Divines. 7. The Post-Office and Electric Telegraph. 8. Stoughton's Ecclesiastical History. 9. Working Men and Religious Institutions.

Christian Remembrancer, April, 1867. (London.)—1. The Counter-Reformation in Bohemia. 2. Pelagius and Celestius. 3. English Poetry under the Stuarts. 4. The La Ferronnays Family. 5. Conington's Æneid of Virgil. 6. The Scottish Liturgy. 7. New America. 8. The "Atrium and Basilica" of Dollinger.

Journal of Sacred Literature, April, 1867. (London.)—1. The Church and the Working Men. 2. Rites and Ceremonies. 3. On the Eternity of Future Punishments. 4. The Tripartite Nature of Man Considered in Relation to Evangelical Doctrines. 5. Mr. Hinton's Metaphysical Views. 6. The Breton Bible. 7. On Ritualism. 8. Plea for a Revised Translation of the Scriptures. 9. Positivism—The Pantheism of Auguste Comte. 10. The State of Parties in the Church of England. 11. The Book of Job—A Revised Translation. 12. The Liturgy of St. Celestine, Bishop of Rome. Syriac Text.

London Quarterly Review, April, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Character of George the Third. 2. Sea Fish and Fisheries. 3. Autobiography of a Physiologist. 4. Westmoreland. 5. The Poetry of Seven Dials. 6. M. Du Chaillu's Recent Travels. 7. Curious Myths of the Middle Ages. 8. New American Religions. 9. Railway Finance. 10. Wellington in the Peninsula. 11. The Four Reform Orators.

North British Review, March, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Policy of Trades-Unions. 2. George Buchanan. 3. The Political Writings of Richard Cobden. 4. On the Character of the Old Northern Poetry. 5. Victor Cousin. 6. The Oyster-Fisheries. 7. Oxford University Extension. 8. The Bengal Famine of 1866.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, April, 1867. (London.)—1. The Divine and Human Natures in Christ. 2. The Liberal Theology. 3. The Sensational Philosophy—Mr. J. S. Mill's Theory of Mind. 4. Renan's History of the Apostles. 5. The organized Structure of the New Testament. 6. Trials of Irving and Campbell of Row. 7. Cyclopædia Literature. 8. Interpretation of the Psalms. 9. The Antiquity of Man.

The ninth article furnishes a valuable zoological answer to the proofs of man's geological antiquity, derived from human remains

found among those of extinct animals, as in various caves and in the Rhine valleys.

In the deposits containing the early indications of man are found the remains of animals, some of which are still living; and others, like the warmly clad mammoth, and the two-horned woolly rhinoceros, are extinct. To admit this is, in the opinion of many geologists, to acknowledge the great antiquity demanded by some modern writers for man. Lyell, in the opening sentence of his work devoted to this subject, summarizes the whole question in the single inquiry, "Whether or no we have sufficient evidence in caves, or in the superficial deposits, to prove the former co-existence of man with certain extinct mammalia?" We can have no hesitation in replying to this in the affirmative. But to what does this commit us? The point and importance of the question lie in the word "extinct." To the geologist this conveys the idea of great antiquity. But that this is a pure assumption will be evident, if we examine the relation which the extinct animals of Britain bear to this living fauna.

Dr. Fleming, in his *Philosophy of Zoology*, (1822,) pointed out the importance of taking into account the animals which formerly inhabited a country in constructing a fauna; he further advocated this method in the paper to which we have already alluded, and he practically illustrated his views in his subsequently published *British Animals*.

The geologist is familiar with the appearance and disappearance of numerous species of animals, whose remains are preserved in the rocks of the earth. This has originated the notion that species, like individuals, have a term of life. At first they appear in small numbers, then increase in importance, afterward decline, and finally disappear. The natural death of a species is spoken of as something corresponding to the natural death of an individual. Whatever truth there may be in this opinion, in regard to the animals that lived in past geological periods, the testimony of history and observation, in regard to the decline of plants and animals on the earth, or their disappearance from it in recent times, is that man is the great agent, either directly or indirectly, in producing such changes. He has within half a century almost destroyed the indigenous flora of St. Helena, and introduced plants from all quarters of the globe belonging to genera totally different from those originally growing on the island. In Britain he has greatly reduced in numbers some of the native animals, others he has completely extirpated from the island, and some of these have shared the same fate elsewhere, so that they are no longer living on the globe—they are extinct. The three kinds of British deer—the stag, the fallow-deer, and the roe—have long been favorite objects of the huntsman's pursuit. Bishop Lesley, in his *De Rebus gestis Scotorum*, (1578,) says that in his day as many as from five hundred to one thousand deer were slain at one hunting match, by the use of bloodhounds and grayhounds. But for the preserved forests, these animals would long ago have perished from our native fauna. Some animals have been brought within narrow bounds, from being hunted for their furs, as the otter, the martin, and the polecat; while others, as the wild cat and fox, have been greatly reduced in numbers, and driven into the more uncultivated and inaccessible districts, because of their preying on domestic animals. All these, however, still exist in Britain, but there are others that have not so successfully resisted the persecution of man. The bear continued to exist till the year 1057, and a century later the wild boar abounded in some English forests, but both fell victims to the attacks of the huntsman. The beaver was a common tenant of our rivers in early times, but its highly prized fur caused its extirpation about the twelfth century; while the wolf was found in Scotland till beyond the middle of the seventeenth century, and in Ireland even later. Numerous skulls and other bones of the *Urus* of Cæsar (*Bos primigenius*) have been found in Britain, but no information exists as to the period of its extirpation in this country. On the continent, however, it was seen by Julius Cæsar, and survived even long after his time. In his account of the Black Forest, in the sixth book of his Gallic War, he gives a description of this now extinct animal, and of the effectual means which were adopted for its destruction. We shall quote the passage, as it is of great importance in connection with this

subject. "The *Uri* are but little less than elephants in size, and are of the species, form, and color of a bull. Their strength is very great, and also their speed. They cannot be brought to endure the sight of men, nor be tamed, even when taken young. The people who take them in pit-falls assiduously destroy them; and young men harden themselves in this labor, and exercise themselves in this kind of chase; and those who have killed a great number—the horns being publicly exhibited in evidence of the fact—obtain great honor." History does not record the fate of the extinct animals which co-existed with the *Urus;* they were probably extirpated before Cæsar visited Germany, but the means adopted for the extinction of this huge animal, and the result, make it probable that man had more to do with the disappearance of all these now extinct quaternary mammals than has been supposed.

The same influences have been operating against the birds as against the quadrupeds of Britain. Eagles and ravens, snipes and lapwings, have been driven, by the gun or cultivation, to restricted districts, within the memory of many now living. The large wood grouse or capercailzie, was found in the pine forests of Scotland till past the middle of last century, the last individual having been killed, as it is believed, in the year 1769. It is now unknown, except in those preserved plantations into which it has been reintroduced from Norway, where it is still abundant. But the most remarkable fact bearing on the question before us, in connection with our native birds, is the very recent extinction of the great auk. This bird was seen so lately as 1822 by Dr. Fleming, who had for some time a living specimen, but it is now not only extirpated from Britain, but it has entirely perished from off the earth. Skins of this bird exist in several collections, but the only skeleton in the British Museum has been recently obtained from a guano deposit in Newfoundland. In our own day the great auk has become extinct.

It is thus evident that a bed is not necessarily very ancient because some of its fossil contents belong to animals that are no longer living.

Dr. Fleming in the paper to which we have referred on the Distribution of British Animals, examined the evidence in regard to man's relation to these extinct animals, and arrived at the same conclusion as that recently arrived at by Lyell. His own words are, "The remains of these extinct animals occur only in the superficial strata, and in fresh water gravel or clay, and may be viewed as connected with the last or modern epoch of the earth's history. Man was an inhabitant of this country at the time these animals flourished, his houses and his instruments having been found in similar situations with their remains." Sir Charles Lyell in his "Antiquity of Man," a work which so much astounded the world, and was declared to have subverted the history of man as recorded in the Mosaic record, finds no facts in support of a greater antiquity than those that were before Dr. Fleming, and are published in this paper. But the conclusion of the two authors are very different. They have both the same question to solve, but they approach it from different directions. Fleming treats the question as a zoologist, and reasoning from the known, from the actual changes produced in the fauna of the country within six or eight centuries, he maintains that, "if we consider the dispersion of the human race over the earth's surface, and the unremittting persecution which they have carried on against the lower animals, during the long term of nearly six thousand years, varying their destructive weapons with the progress of improvements, and extending their ravages with the increase of their wants, we come to the conclusion, that man must have altered greatly the geographical range of many species, and may even have succeeded in effecting the total destruction of not a few." Among these he includes the extinct animals which were man's contemporaries.

Important corroborative testimony is given by the archæologist in support of the comparatively limited time required by the zoologist. The investigation into the early traces of man on the globe are as properly within the domains of archæology as of geology. There is here a common ground of inquiry legitimately open to both sciences. The archæologist ascends to it from the present, like the zoologist, but he has more historical material to form a basis for his inquiries. He has all the light that sacred and profane history throws on the early manners, customs, and employment of different people; he has the information supplied by

the deciphered inscriptions of Egypt and Nineveh; he has the numerous instructive ancient sculptures of different peoples; and in addition to all this, he is able to study among his contemporaries in different parts of the world races representing almost all stages of civilization, from the primitive manufacturers of the rude Abbeville hatchets to the most advanced natives of Caucasian descent. With all these certain data, and with the numerous checks which present themselves in his investigations, it is evident that his testimony would be of importance in approximating to an estimate as to the age of man. If it supported the "vast distance of time" required by some geologists, it might cause us to doubt whether or not the zoologist might not have greatly under-estimated the time required for the changes in the animal kingdom: but when we find it supporting and confirming the more limited estimate, it must compel us at once to get rid of any lingering notions that there be more in the geological view than what we have perceived. An illustration will exhibit the relation that a geological estimate bears to the more certain computation by the antiquarian. The late Mr. L. Horner excavated the Nile mud from the base of the statue of Rameses at Memphis, for the purpose of ascertaining what thickness of sediment had been deposited since that statue was erected. Accepting the determination by Lepsius, that the year 1361 B. C. was in the middle of the reign of Rameses, and assuming this as the probable date of the foundation of the statue, he found that during the space of three thousand two hundred and eleven years (up till 1850) a deposit of nine feet four inches had taken place round the pedestal, or at the rate of three and one half inches in a century. Assuming this to have been the uniform rate of increase, he continued his examination by boring to a depth of thirty-two feet, where he reached the sand of the desert. In the lowest layer of the mud a fragment of burnt brick was found, which at the assumed rate of deposit would be thirteen thousand years old, Fragments of pottery, as well as portions of brick, were found in others of the many borings that were carried on under his direction, all attesting an equally great antiquity. The pottery was, however, declared to be of Roman manufacture; and even Sir Charles Lyell, in summing up his account of these investigations, allows that "the experiments by Mr. Horner are not considered by experienced Egyptologists to have been satisfactory."

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1867. (London.)—1. Religious Prospects in France. 2. Scientific Farming. 3. The Civil Service of the British Empire. 4. Apollonius of Tyana. 5. Swiss Lake Dwellings. 6. Smiles's Lives of the Engineers. 7. Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately.

The fifth article very satisfactorily disposes of the argument in favor of the pre-Adamic antiquity of man, from the Swiss lake-dwellings. In the winter of 1853 and 1854 the Swiss lakes sunk to a remarkably low level, and disclosed the relics of ancient houses and villages built upon piles, far into the depths of the lakes. They were brought under the inspection of Dr. Keller, president of the Antiquarian Society of Zurich, who made record of his observations, which form the basis of the present article. Further researches disclosed a vast variety of similar remains in different localities. An immense number of the relics betoken ancient human life, and disclose different epochs of civilization, indicated as the *stone period*, the *brass period*, and the *iron period*. Implements of daily use, and cereals and animals used as food, are abundant. Bones of the urus and aurochs indicate antiquity, and a period of at least seven thousand years has been demanded for

the present problem. The claim may, for the present, be considered as settled and dismissed by the following remarks:

We find no scientific compulsion, however, which insists upon a very enormous antiquity for the pile dwellings. We do not admit this compulsion in view of the question of the antiquity of the human race as a whole. It may be perfectly true —we suppose it cannot be honestly denied—that man has co-existed in Western Europe with the mammoth, the rhinoceros tichorinus, and other extinct mammals. But there is another explanation of this phenomenon besides the theory which runs man's age in the earth up into a dozen or twenty millenniums beyond the starting points of history. Suppose, instead of man being so much older than we used to think him, it should turn out that *our mammals are so much younger, and that the rhinoceros and mammoth period must be brought lower down, and not the human period pushed further back.* So far as we know, science has not shown the improbability of this hypothesis; and, until it is proved untenable, we hold it as, in view of everything, a more scientific solution of the question in debate than that furnished by its rival. Here, however, neither Robenhausen nor any other phenomena with which we have to do demand, or even need, a space of time greater than some one or two thousand years before the Christian era. While we believe, with Dr. Keller, that a high antiquity must be assigned to the so-called stone settlements, we are not surprised to hear M. Troyon, near the outset of his volume, say: "Let it be well understood, then, that the stone age—the relics of which are discovered in the lakes and in the graves—is recognized, in this work, as subsequent to the Mosaic deluge."

Further, we heartily indorse Dr. Keller's conviction, that the lake dwellers, whatever the time of their coming into Switzerland, and how great and numerous soever the changes which passed upon them during their long occupation of the country, were one and the same people. M. Troyon contends that the nationality of the stone people was quite distinct from that of the race which used the metal implements, and that the establishment of bronze and iron settlements upon the territory occupied by those of stone must be attributed to immigration and conquest. Dr. Keller argues, and we think triumphantly, that the facts of the case are strongly opposed to such a theory. Two considerations alone, both urged by Dr. Keller, appear to us to be fatal to the idea of successive and diverse populations. In the first place, it is incredible that two or three distinct races should all take to the unnatural and laborious way of living adopted by the pile dwellers. If bronze men or iron men had invaded the country of the stone men, and had made themselves masters of their settlements, it is morally certain they would most carefully abstain from the practice of living in huts built on the tops of timbers thrust into lake bottoms. And, again, if this were supposable, it is not supposable that such heterogeneous populations should drive their piles, and lay their platforms, and build and furnish their houses, and fashion their chief implements, as was the fact with the lake dwellers, all on the same model. Nothing is more certain than that the pile dwellings in every age are constructed in precisely the same manner; and how this circumstance can be made to tally with M. Troyon's theory, or with any other theory than that of the race-unity of the lake-dwelling people, we are at a loss to understand.

What, then, was the nationality of the Swiss lake dwellers? M. Troyon says that the men of bronze were Celts, and that the men of stone were a pre-Celtic population. Dr. Keller maintains that all were Celts together. His words in summing up are:

"Believing as we do that the different settlements in what are called the stone, the bronze, and the iron ages, do not indicate a succession of races or the destruction of one people by another, but merely different grades of civilization among one and the same people, and a continued progress in handicraft ability; believing also that the lake dwellers did not form a peculiar caste, but, as is shown at Ebersberg and other places, belonged to the very people who at the same time lived on the main land; and knowing that according to the universal opinion of many French and English antiquaries, the bronze objects of a peculiar form and

quite as peculiar ornamentation, such as those found in the settlements, both on the land and in the lakes, have always been attributed to the Celts; knowing also that history makes no mention of any other people but the Celts who in the very earliest ages possessed the middle of Europe, and in later times received their civilization from the Romans, we believe that it would be contrary to all the facts adduced to arrive at any other conclusion but this, that the builders of the lake dwellings were a branch of the Celtic population of Switzerland, but that the earlier settlements belong to the pre-historic period, and had already fallen into decay before the Celts took their place in the history of Europe."—P. 313.

To this finding—a finding which sorts exactly with all we know of the Helvetii and Celtic populations of Central Europe in general, whether from Cæsar or other ancient authorities—we give our cordial adhesion. Subject to the correction of future discovery, we hold with Dr. Keller, that our lake dwellers were a portion of that great Celtic migration which started, when the world was young, from the steppes and waters of High Asia; that they came, we know not when, but many hundreds of years before Christ, into Switzerland, bringing with them the dog, cow, sheep, goat, and horse, understanding agriculture likewise, and cultivating wheat, barley, and flax; that moved by some mysterious idiosyncrasy of race, and urged by pressure of external circumstances, they addicted themselves to the strange fashion of living which we have described in the foregoing pages; and that the habit of such a manner of life being formed, and corroborated by their lot, they continued age after age to follow their primeval customs, till the power and civilization of the Romans came and abolished them for ever.—Pp. 423–25.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Italy and the War of 1866. 2. The Papal Drama. 3. Thomas Hobbes. 4. Contemporary Music and Musical Literature. 5. New America. 6. Mr. Swinburne's Poetry. 7. The Hopes and Fears of Reformers.

The Westminster is the great master and model of infidel literature, whose tactics an increasing amount of the American press is ambitiously struggling to ape. It assails every institution and doctrine of Christianity; the Bible, the Christ-history, the Church of all denominations, the pulpit, the religious press and literature; but in all this persistent process it claims to be Christian, religious, the true follower of Jesus, and resents with fierceness the bigotry that questions its really superior religiosity. To all this duplicity the present number contains a significant passage, which perhaps furnishes the true key. *The assumption of the Christian name is provisional.* It is to last only so long as the power and prestige of the great orthodox Church overawes a perpendicular profession of infidelity. When that dread influence expires the name of Christ will be repudiated, and the very word *Christianity* will be consigned to contempt.

This question of a name has much more importance than would seem at first sight properly to belong to it; for if the name be retained, it would imply with many the retaining of all the accretions and falsities which have gathered round it; and if the name be dropped, the truths, practical and speculative, which have been implicated in Christianity, even under its corrupt forms, would appear to some to be rejected with it. Mr. Mackay does not definitely deal with this question. Perhaps he would adopt Lessing's solution, calling the religion of reason "the religion of Christ," in contradistinction to the "Christian religion"—a religion striving to appropriate Christ's sentiments and character instead of idly

following or worshiping his person. Or, as the liberal Christians in the Dutch Church describe it, by saying the Christian Church is founded on a following of what Christ taught, not on a speculation concerning what he was. Still, even to this extent the historical ground is not so firm beneath our feet as we should desire. For if we admit that "the true principle of Christianity," as we would understand it, "as well as of morality, may be called self-regulated liberty;" or, say that Christianity and morality alike indicate the "convergence and consistency of freedom and obligation," and that if the Christian law is a "law of liberty," (James i, 25; ii, 12,) "morality admits no better definition than freedom well understood;" or, that "love is the fulfilling of the law," with St. Paul, as with Aristotle it comprehended justice, *wherein do we find a differentia for Christianity?* Or if, when stripped of its husk, Christianity is nothing more than true morality, may they nevertheless legitimately assume the special name of Christians who have, as a matter of historical fact, derived their morality (with whatever "accidents") from the personal teaching of Jesus Christ; or here again must they concede that they have derived it from the teaching attributed to a Christ in some of his words and acts ideal? In such case, whatever they might willingly call themselves, will others acquiesce in what will be termed the usurpation of a sacred title? These are of course merely practical questions, and *not such as press for the present for an answer; but sooner or later they will require one.*

This not-to-be-forgotten passage at once exhibits some of the subterfuges by which the Christian name is to be colorably retained "for the present," and points to the "sooner or later" when antichrist will reveal himself under his own true title. How far behind in this march of boasted "progress" will our "Nation" and "Tribune" linger?

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (ESSAYS AND REVIEWS.) 1867. Third Number. 1. ACHELIS, On the Oath of God with Himself. 2. SCHRADER, The Duration of the Second Temple. 3. LINDER, Remarks on some Passages of the New Testament. 4. PAUL, A few more Remarks on the Time of the Lord's Supper according to John. 5. ZAHN, Additional Remarks on the article "Papias of Hierapolis." Reviews of Lagarde's *Constitutiones Apostolorum* and *Clementina;* WOLTERS'S *Der Heidelberger Catechismus*; SCHMIDT, *Encyclopädie des gesammten Erziehungs und Unterrichtswesens*, and of an Anonymous Work on the Reconstruction of the Established Church of Prussia.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (JOURNAL FOR SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY.) 1867. First Number. 1. HOLTZMANN, the Address of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. DR. OVERBECK, Two New Testimonies of Papias for the Acts and the Fourth Gospel. 3. LIPSIUS, the Times of Marcion and Heracleon. 4. HILGENFELD, Protestant and Roman Opponents. (Tischendorf and Langen.) 5. MERX, Remark on the Syriac Translation of the Ignatian Epistles. 6. HILGENFELD, the Essenes and Jesus.

The system of the Essenes is still a favorite subject of discussion for German scholars. Most of them agree with Baur and Zeller, who find its origin in an influence of Pythagorism, or at least of Orphish-Bacchish Asceticism upon Judaism. Dr. Ewald's

opinion that Essenism sprang from the same school of pious men (חֲסִידִים, Ἀσιδαῖοι) from which previously the Pharisees had sprung, has been supported only by Dr. Geiger, a Jewish writer. Dr. Ritschl, who derived Essenism from a desire to establish a universal priesthood of the chosen people of God, has likewise met with but little approval. Dr. Hilgenfeld, in the above number of the Journal of Scientific Theology, undertakes to prove the historical connection of Essenism with Parsism and Buddhism. He is of opinion that the Jews in Babylonia, even after the destruction of the Persian empire, constituted the connecting link between the Jewish religion and the system of Zoroaster, and that the influence of the former upon the latter was strengthened by the restoration of a Persian empire under the Arsacidæ, (250 before Christ.) Buddhism, on the other hand, had become known outside of India since Alexander the Great, and had in particular begun to exercise a strong influence upon Parsism. Dr. Hilgenfeld then points out the doctrines and usages which he thinks are common to Essenes and the Magi of Parsism. Both appear as soothsayers, foretellers of future events. The division into three classes, (novices of the first years, novices of the two following years, and members of the order;) the hatchet, girdle, white habit, and sacred baths of the novices; the solemn oath which was taken upon entering the order, and which was the only oath ever allowed them; the abstention from meat, wine, and bloody sacrifices; the abandonment of private property; the observance of silence before the rising of the sun; the veneration shown to the sun; the belief in predestination and the peculiar views of a future state—are mentioned among the tenets that are common to both systems. Many of these points are also to be found in Buddhism, to the influence of which religion Hilgenfeld also traces the distinction of four degrees of perfection among the members of the order, the recommendation of celibacy, the belief in the equality of all men, and the consequent opposition to all kinds of servitude, the prominent importance attributed to the virtues of compassion and almsgiving. The influence of Buddhism upon Judaism, Dr. Hilgenfeld thinks, was all the easier, as, according to Buddhist writers, Buddhism, about the time of the third Œcumenical Council of Buddhism, which was held in 247 or 246 B. C., was flourishing at Alexandria, and as the Therapeutæ of Egypt show an even greater similarity with Buddhism than the Essenes of Palestine. Comparing Essenism with the teachings of Christ and the life of the primitive Church, Dr. Hilgenfeld regards Essenism as the highest approach of the ante-Christian times toward Christianity, and he thinks that

the attempt to establish community of goods in the primitive Church and the lifetime of the apostles seem to indicate a historical connection with Essenism.

Art. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. By William G. T. Shedd, D.D., Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. 8vo., pp. 428. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

Most of the materials of this volume have passed through several phases, and have thus been subjected to the tests of criticism and time. Dr. Shedd's position for fifteen years in the Auburn Theological Seminary brought them before young candidates for the ministry in the form of lectures. As articles in his denominational Review, a portion of them have awakened considerable interest; and now, combined with two or three separate essays, and thoroughly revised, they are reproduced in the present volume. Clear statement, vigorous thought, and an evangelical spirit pervade its pages. Most treatises on homiletics are dry and tedious, perhaps from their scientific style and multiplicity of details, which may be very necessary in works designed to present all that can be said on the subject; but this is fresh and glowing to the close. Dr. Shedd writes for practical men, and says all that such men need. We like the book: we like its principles. We wish they might be burned into the souls of the entire ministry of the land. The doctor writes sometimes with a free pen, but we are not sure but we like those parts the best. He seems to have selected those rules which, as an instructor, and perhaps in his own experience, he had found most efficient in the formation of a good preacher, and boldly rejects much that some other writers have thought of value, as contributing to confusion and embarrassment.

Dr. Shedd sets out with the conviction that the great need of the Church at the present day is a "masculine and vigorous rhetoric, wedded with an earnest and active pastoral zeal." This is the key-note of the volume. Preaching is, with him, a speaking to the popular mind upon the subject of religion with a view to influence it. Certain facts in regard to God and man are to be established, and certain religious truths are to be impressed upon all who come to hear; and the permanence of the impression

which is made constitutes the true test of excellence in a sermon. The sermon is not an essay or a treatise, but an address to an audience. Like an address upon a secular topic, it must be oratorical in its form and style. It is an oration upon the most sacred of subjects, "more solid and weighty in its contents, more serious and earnest in its tone, and more sober in its coloring, than the deliberative, or judicial, or panegyrical oration of secular eloquence;" but, nevertheless, an oration, employing all the powers of the mind in an effort to move the will of the hearer.

Fundamental to such a "masculine and vigorous rhetoric" is a thorough understanding of the word of God. The preacher's spirit must be pervaded by the Spirit of revelation. There is the truth which must be uttered, given by authority of God himself under the inspiration of his Spirit. Exegetical study alone can give freshness and force to the utterances of the minister, so that he will speak as the oracles of God, with authority. Preaching is his business: it is the work to which his life is consecrated, and to it his best intellectual strength must be given. Let him, then, be thorough, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." There is a general preparation for it, covering years of study and toil, as in the cultivation of a homiletic mental habit; the formation of a high ideal of a sermon, with constant efforts to reach it; an absolute self-reliance in the immediate construction of a sermon, discarding the skeletons and discourses of others, and never "stealing" them, for that is unnecessary for him who has formed correct habits, and unwise and wicked for any; and above all, the maintenance of a spiritual mind. In the immediate preparation of the sermon, our author will not allow a word to be written until the intellect and heart are brought into a fervid and awakened condition, in which the feelings are warm and glowing. There is doubtless some power in the truth itself to induce this state of mind, but it is to be sought especially in devout meditation and earnest prayer. Then let him give himself entirely to the task of composition, avoiding prolixity, and driving home with all his might the one idea of the sermon. A preacher who acts upon these principles will be likely to confine his topics of discourse to the evangelical doctrines of the Bible; to speak of sin and guilt, of grace and redemption, in preference to the more philosophic themes of immorality and virtue; to use great directness of style and speech; and to take care always to speak with a loving heart as he rebukes iniquity, and repeats the threatenings of the Almighty. Such preaching cannot fail to do good, and it is needed everywhere.

As to style, Dr. Shedd's work itself illustrates the three essential properties which he names, plainness, force, and beauty. He finds, too, really, only three classes of sermons, the topical, textual, and expository. He advises that one sermon of each Sabbath be extemporaneous, that is, unwritten, but as thoroughly thought out as if it were written. The chapter devoted to the department of liturgics is not the least important or interesting; and the subject is one that deserves a better attention than is sometimes given it, especially as regards the selection and reading of hymns and the Holy Scriptures.

Rather more than one fourth of the volume is devoted to pastoral theology. Dr. Shedd has an exalted view of the office of pastor, and the only correct one. "The foundation of influence in parochial life," he says, "is in the clergyman's character, and the root of clerical character is piety." The pastor is the preacher speaking to individuals privately and personally, going from house to house, and making himself felt religiously in the social and domestic life of his people. The pastor's very calling demands eminent spirituality, and tends to its culture. His position requires a high intellectual character, that he may exert an influence upon all classes of men. These thoughts are fully elaborated, as are also the duties of pastoral visiting and catechizing, and in a charming style. The author is, on these topics, a decided conservative. He knows no new and patented mode of ministerial life, by which what some think its drudgery may be avoided, and the Church still built up. The only path he knows is that of patient, hard, earnest toil. It is, indeed, the only path which in the long run leads to real success. D. A. W.

Studies in the Gospels. By Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo., pp. 326. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1867.

"Have little or nothing to do with commentaries," said an old clerical wiseacre to a young inquiring minister; "let commentaries alone, and your preaching will at least be original, your ideas will be your own." "Have nothing to do with books on the stars," as well might an old professor say to a young astronomer; "look at the skies and your thoughts will be original, and quite your own." This young astronomer would thereby know little of astronomy; and this young preacher would know just as little of the depth of Scripture truth. The simple looker at the skies has from time immemorial been able to guide his bark safely by

the north star; and the simple reader of the Bible has been able to direct his path to the blessed haven. But what knows the former of the immensity of God's system of worlds; and what knows the latter of the immense depth of God's truth in his word? The advances in natural science have hardly been more unequivocal than the advances in expository science. If any one doubts this, let him read the Gospel narrative of the Temptation as most persons read it thirty years ago, or as it appears in Clarke's Commentary, and then read it in the light of Dr. Trench's exposition, to say nothing of those which have preceded it during the last ten years; and surely he must admit that commentary on God's word is a most advancing science; and that he who neglects it is very likely to be quite unfit to expound the word of God in the Church of God.

Dr. Trench's expositions in the present volume are the result of an extensive miscellaneous reading, of a close scrutiny of the sacred text, and especially of a wide and thorough study of—COMMENTATORS; commentators ancient and modern, commentators Catholic and Protestant, commentators in Greek and Latin, in German, French, and English. And it is wonderful to note how much the jejuneness of the commentators of fifty years ago resulted from neglect of the ancient commentators. Dr. Trench's special favorites are Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Maldonatus. How deep, copious, and acute his expositions thence become, those who are familiar with his works on the Miracles and on the Parables may readily anticipate; for although the present volume can scarce be considered equal to those of its predecessors, yet it is amply worthy their learned author.

Sixteen passages from the Gospels are treated; of which the Temptation, the Samaritan Woman, the Transfiguration, and the Penitent Thief are the principal. In our few notes here on Dr. Trench, our readers must allow us to refer freely to our own labors over the same ground. The lovers of Scripture exposition must not infer from our touching upon points of disagreement only that they will not find this volume a rich treat.

On the Temptation Dr. Trench clearly and forcibly illustrates the fact that Satan proposed to Christ to become—just what the world would have its Messiah be—ANTICHRIST; the false Christ which Secularism and Rationalism to this hour are worshiping. When he comes to the question, Could Christ have sinned? he notices the argument that moral merit in refusing requires possibility of consenting; but he still maintains an *impossibility*, in the instance of Jesus, falsely imagining that he clears the difficulty by

pronouncing it a "*moral*" *impossibility*. What is this *moral impossibility?* If it means such a measurement of psychological motive force upon the will as to render the yielding to sin sequently impossible to the will by the law of cause and effect, or of antecedent and consequent, then moral merit is destroyed. If it does not mean this, then there is no "impossibility," moral or non-moral, in the case. If it does mean this, then there was no moral desert. Dr. Trench wanders from the point when he tells us that there was here in Christ "something higher than free-will," (liberum arbitrium,) namely, the blessed *necessity of good*, (beata necessitas boni.) The question is not how *high* the elements here are; but are there the conditions of moral merit or demerit? Was Christ a free agent, able to accept or reject? And any necessity, moral or physical, high or low, that excludes that alternative power, voids the merit of the act. Such is the sound old Arminian doctrine.

Dr. Trench, in his exposition of the two disciples walking from Emmaus, dismisses summarily the belief that one of the two was Luke himself. We could wish that the reader would compare our argument (on Luke xxiv, 13) in favor of that belief. Nor is it an unimportant point; for if Luke was at Jerusalem at this time, he was also probably present at the scene of Pentecost, (as we hope to make plausible in a future volume,) and was himself part of the first Jerusalem Church, whose early history he so richly describes. Those who have read Rénan's "Apostles" will see how such a view refutes his assaults upon the credibility of the first half of Acts.

Dr. Trench, in his exposition of the Penitent Thief, discards the plain statement of an evangelist that both thieves at first reviled Christ. We have shown, however, we trust, in our commentary on Matt. xxvii, 45–50, and 55–61, that this relenting of the thief from a previous reviling perfectly synchronized with a relenting of all present at the crucifixion, during and succeeding the hours of darkness and earthquake. This general relenting is a point suggested by Blunt; but has been overlooked, we believe, universally by commentators, and its solution of the change in the penitent thief has been entirely unseen. The same change took place, for instance, in the Centurion who first crucified and then confessed Jesus to be Son of God.

The Minor Prophets. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical; designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. Henry Cowles. 12mo., pp. 424. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

Our judgment of this work will be best expressed by comparing it with others occupying the same field of investigation—taking

into view the author's aim, and ascertaining how far he has been successful in reaching it. Passing by the voluminous commentaries of those who have undertaken to expound the whole of the sacred writings, and even the works of a few who have made the interpretation of prophecy a special study, (such as Bishop Newton, now nearly obsolete,) we notice first of all the "Critical, Philological, and Exegetical Commentary of Henderson, which has been highly and deservedly esteemed by every diligent and earnest student of the Bible for its philological research and critical acumen; and for the learning, trustworthiness, and practical value of its notes, entitling it to a place in every minister's library; and which has not been wholly superseded by any later works on the same portions of Holy Scripture. We observe, next, the incomparable "Explanatory and Practical" Commentary of Dr. Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church, of which only three parts have yet appeared, (Hosea to Micah,) a work on which the author informs us he has spent more than thirty years. From a scholar and divine at once so learned, laborious, and devout, we are prepared to expect much; nor does his work disappoint us. It stands, like the wisdom and glory of Solomon, unequaled by all that have preceded it, and we may venture to say, will be long unsurpassed by any that shall come after it. If an expositor of the Holy Scriptures is bound to furnish a faithful rendering of the original text, to "give the sense," and "cause" us "to understand the reading," then Dr. Pusey has ably met the obligation, having given us throughout the literal meaning of the text, evolved, after mature study, without needless show of learning, or embarrassing and diverting discussion. He seldom departs from our standard English version, except where the translators have failed to understand and represent the original; and he invariably justifies the changes he makes. While he diligently uses grammars, lexicons, ancient and modern versions, and examines "every commentator likely or unlikely to contribute anything to the understanding of the sacred text," he is careful not to be used by any of them. His pages are not sprinkled with Hebrew or Arabic type, nor the dimensions of his exposition swollen with an array of names and authorities exhibited for display—quoted to be confuted, or to sustain his own interpretations. Such pedantry Dr. Pusey studiously eschews, esteeming it as valueless as it is cheap and popular. He presents us with the results of the latest and ripest criticism, without exhibiting the process by which it was reached. He sets before us the majestic and stately temple unsurrounded by the unsightly

scaffolding employed in its erection; and even brings us within its sacred precincts, where we behold the transcendent beauty of its treasures, influencing our faith, reverence, and obedience. In a word, he has developed "the meaning of Holy Scripture out of Holy Scripture itself;" and exhibits to his readers "truth side by side with the fountain from which it is drawn, enabling them to see something more of its riches than a passer-by or a careless reader sees upon its surface." We hope soon to possess it completed, and that an American edition of it may be speedily brought out. To ministers especially we heartily commend it.

The work of Mr. Cowles is unlike either of the former in not a few respects. It is less critical and philological than Henderson's, and is neither so scholarly, copious, and practical as Pusey's. Nevertheless, to thousands in America, to whom these works are almost inaccessible, it will prove of high value. His method is to "meet the wants, not of Hebrew scholars only or chiefly, but of all English readers;" and "specially those who have been and are yet to be trained to thoughtful study of God's word in Sabbath-schools and Bible classes, and, indeed, all those lay men and women who love the sacred Scriptures, and who naturally wish to know their full and precise meaning." In the main, it has been his "plan to give results only, and not the processes by which they have been reached," yet points of great practical interest and value. For example, "those prophecies respecting Messiah and his kingdom which yet remain in part to be fulfilled," he has "deemed it important to discuss fundamentally and thoroughly, so that the reader may see what principles of interpretation" he "adopts," and why; and also, to what results they have led him. Here we may properly inquire, How far has our author been successful in accomplishing what he has undertaken? Admirably well, we reply, according to our humble judgment. The primary "sense" of the prophet's language is in most instances clearly apprehended, and expressed with commendable brevity and force; and this is no small praise, and we cheerfully accord it. His principles of prophetic interpretation we would pronounce sound and evangelical, avoiding the extremes of unbridled rationalism on the one hand, and of an overstrained supernaturalism on the other. Without pledging ourselves to every interpretation which he has given, we allow that he has, nevertheless, supplied us with a valuable "help to the better understanding" of a portion of the Holy Scriptures, on which it is by no means easy to write a satisfactory commentary. Two dissertations, one "On the Criteria for distinguishing, in the Prophetic Life, between things seen and done

in vision only, and things done in fact," and another, "On the two Millennial Theories," add something to the worth of the book. On the whole, for ministers—who in this age of public activity have but little time critically to examine the text and the original for themselves—and also for enlightened private students of God's Book, this work will prove invaluable. We heartily commend it to their attention, and thank the author for it. E. B. H.

Helena's Household. A Tale of Rome in the First Century. 12mo., pp. 422. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The narrative in this volume opens with the approach of St. Paul to Rome in charge of Julius the centurion, and in company with Luke and the Christians who had come as far as Appii Forum and Tres Tabernæ to meet them. Helena, a spiritual Athenian woman, who had in her youth been taught with her brother Cineas in the philosophy of Plato, is the wife of Labeo, one of the Sulpicii, and, in spirit, a proud representative of the true Roman, who in Britain was the heroic soldier, but whose great heart was devoted to her, and Marcus their little son. Her conversations with Cineas disclose the cravings of her soul for what philosophy could not give, a communion with God, and a consciousness of his interest in her. Cineas delights in his sublime intellectual perceptions of the Deity; but she must know that God loves. The repetition of the Lord's prayer by Marcus, overheard by her, gave the first intimation of the actual fatherhood of God. The child, who had learned from his Christian nurse the story of Jesus, becomes his mother's teacher in the first truths of the Gospel, which like a little child she receives, and in which she finds rest to her soul. No character is more artless or natural than this child, who by his gentle love conquers the brave but barbaric Briton whom his sympathy had delivered from death. The court of Nero, with its vices and infamies, is sufficiently laid open before us to show the central power of all the hate and opposition to Christianity. The hour of persecution comes, and we are led to the catacombs, where Helena and Marcus find a refuge after their escape from prison, and where to-day may be read most sad memorials of those days of suffering. Neither the nervous, sensitive child, nor his mother, ever recovered from the terrible impressions then made; but the triumphant hope of immortality in which they died, proved long afterward a power which drew other souls to the foot of the cross. Cineas, the sorrowing mourner, can find nothing in Plato, or Pindar, or

Æschylus to comfort him. Labeo, disgusted with the court, bereaved of his heart's idols, and utterly disconsolate, finds no peace in arms, no hope in philosophy. The ministry of sorrows drives them to the Man of sorrows, whose embassadors they afterward become.

It is not an easy literary task to reproduce a picture of a period so different from our own times, and in which so many different and contrary elements are involved; but our author has succeeded to an extent truly gratifying. Isaac, the learned and faithful slave, but bigoted Jew; Hegio, the unprincipled Syrian; Galdus, the Briton, whose sense of justice rewards the treachery of Hegio by contriving his summary execution as a Christian; Julius the centurion, are, with others, characters represented with great accuracy. The volume shows not only an acquaintance with the facts of history, but a penetration into the spirit of the Greek philosophy, and the profounder and more spiritual truths of the Gospel.

D. A. W.

Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D. D., and JAMES STRONG, S. T. D. Vol. i, 8vo., pp. 947. A–B. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

We congratulate the authors and the Church upon the appearance of this first installment of the long promised Cyclopedia. With us the *delay* seems not unreasonably long. There are those who seem to imagine that a thorough commentary or cyclopedia can be rolled off by the author, in addition to other multifarious labors, as rapidly and as easily as by the reader. But the witty Sheridan once well remarked that "easy reading is terribly hard writing." The rail-track without a jar to the rider, is a result of mighty labor as well as of exact science by the layer. Let us "learn to labor, and to wait" for those who labor. Meanwhile we hope that there may be no failure to complete a work whose opening promises so largely, nor failure of success with the public after completion.

The attainment of a perfect sacred encyclopedia must be the cumulative result of the many successive attempts of many successive laborers. Each successor must select, add to, and complete the labors of its predecessor. The *finale*, so far as such a thing can be reached, must be, so to speak, *all-embracing*. The sacred scholar needs but one religious cyclopedia in his library, and that should yield him always the thing he can properly inquire for. A simply biblical encyclopedia, that tells nothing of theology, a biblico-theological dictionary that gives no ecclesiastical history or sacred

biography, will not serve. Such separation renders too many books necessary. Hence Drs. M'Clintock and Strong have done wisely in giving us a complete Thesaurus for the library of every minister and Christian scholar. It is a grand step beyond any previously completed attempt in the language.

The work is *fairer* than any previous work of the kind. Our Calvinistic brethren will doubtless pronounce it one-sided, in sad forgetfulness that it but restores the balance from an old one-sidedness. It takes in a large amount of English and American matter of which Germany is ignorant. The one-sidedness of Hertzog may be recognized by looking at his treatment of the great men on the opposite sides of the Arminian discussion, in which, for instance, the reader will look in vain for the great name of Curcellæus. The present writers may have carried their introduction of clerical names and biographies perhaps questionably far, but they have been unquestionably impartial.

The great merits of the work, its great utility to our ministers, require that it should be amply sustained. It must specially be sustained by our own Church. It will be in itself a minister's library.

The present work will be the subject of a future Quarterly article.

A New Translation of Job, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles. With Introductions and Notes, chiefly explanatory. By GEORGE R. NOYES, D.D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew, and Dexter Lecturer in Harvard University. Third edition, carefully revised, with additional notes. 12mo., pp. 351. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1867.

A New Translation of the Book of Psalms, and of the Proverbs. With Introductions and Notes, chiefly explanatory. By GEORGE R. NOYES, D. D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew, etc., and Dexter Lecturer in Harvard University. Third edition, 12mo., pp. 421. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1867.

Dr. Noyes's fine volumes are to us an adumbration how much might be done, and how much is not done, by our Old Testament scholars, in bringing out the holy classics in their own true beauty before the Christian public. He gives to sacred scholarship much of the attractiveness of elegant literature. His work is done, of course, from the Rationalistic standpoint; but it is well for us to see what at its best estate that standpoint can furnish. His expositions are underlaid with no doctrinal depth, and inspired with very little evangelic spirit, being below the spiritual level of either the Jewish or the Christian Church. And yet to our ministry, so small a minority of whom study the inspired originals,

we strongly recommend these volumes as special aids in bringing the mind to a clear appreciation of the real nature of the old Hebrew records.

Dr. Noyes is neither obtrusive nor dogmatical in the statement of his views. The great body of his translation is unaffected by their peculiarity, and might have been written by a Methodist scholar. Generally, where the passage requires it, he rather states the different views than argues either. He sees no Messiah in the Psalms; no Christ, we suppose, in the Old Testament. To our view, if Christ is not in the Old Testament there is no Christ at all. We suppose that "Jesus, who is called Christ," knew a great deal better than any of us the meaning of the Old Testament prophecy; and if Jesus, even after his resurrection, (Luke xxiv, 44–47,) did not find himself in the prophets and the psalms, then the New Testament is a very unreliable book, and Christianity as therein taught contains a great deal more falsehood than truth. So it appears to us; perhaps not so to Dr. Noyes; and if his piety finds its best nutriment in his thin system, it is no wish of ours to quench the smoking flax. Thus much, however, we may say, that however alimentary it may be to his spiritual taste, it could exert little power over the secular body, and would possess no self-sustaining vitality amid the surging deluge of a sensual age. The left wing of Unitarianism is at this hour proclaiming the practicability of a true piety in Atheism.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. Hackett, D. D., with the co-operation of Mr. Ezra Abbot, A. M., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. 8vo., pp. 221. Nos. 1 and 2. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

Biblical scholars will gladly welcome the issue of an American edition of Smith's valuable Dictionary of the Bible, edited by so accomplished a scholar as Dr. Hackett, from the press of Hurd & Houghton. The work, as first published, distanced all its English rivals, and as republished in America is a great improvement upon the English edition. It is more judiciously arranged, an immense mass of corrections have been made, illustrations from late Oriental researches have been incorporated, new articles have been furnished, fuller recognition of American scholars and works has been made. The results of the very latest researches are gathered. Among the American contributors to the present edition we find Conant, Schaff, Shedd, H. B. Smith, W. F. Warren, and President Wolsey. Dr. Hackett's notes are numerous and valuable. It will be published by subscription, medium octavo size, in monthly numbers

of one hundred and twelve pages each. It is doubtless the best purely biblical dictionary published.

We note the following passage on the Adamic name:

> The generic term Adam, man, becomes in the case of the first man a *denominative*. Supposing the Hebrew language to represent accurately the primary ideas connected with the formation of man, it would seem that the appellation bestowed by God was given to keep alive in Adam the memory of his mortal nature; whereas the name by which he preferred to designate himself was Ish, a man of substance or worth. (Gen. ii, 23.)

The Christ of the Apostles' Creed the Voice of the Church against Arianism, Strauss, and Renan. With an Appendix by Rev. W. A. Scott, D. D. Pastor of the Forty-second-street Church, New York. 12mo., pp. 432. Anson D. F. Randolph. 1867.

Dr. Scott here furnishes that view of Christ maintained by the New Testament Church from the first advent to the second. Infidels and Rationalists can frame what fancy sketches they please; the gospels, the epistles, and the primitive creed furnish the data, trusting to which the Church of the faithful feels no difficulty in finding her Lord. Dr. Scott makes use of the great expounders of the creed, Witsius, Pearson, and others, yet shapes and modifies the whole with an independent mind. Some defects of method and style in these lectures arise from their pulpit origin. They are better adapted to inform and confirm the believer than to battle and baffle the thorough-bred skeptic. But the inquiring and intelligent Christian will find profit in their study.

Dr. Scott quotes from Sir William Rowan Hamilton an ingenious suggestion that our Lord was ten days in ascending to the highest heaven. His body moved through *space* and required *time*, as we see by its gradually receding from the eyes of the apostles. It went from one spot, the hill of Bethany, to another spot, where it now is. What was the amount of time in this passage through space from point to point? We know, at any rate, that the Spirit was not to be sent until his full ascension, and we know that it was just ten days after that the Spirit was sent; that is, ten days from the Ascension to the Pentecost.

Out of Harness. Sketches, Narrative and Descriptive. By Thomas Guthrie, D.D. Crown 8vo., pp. 388. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The same beautiful simplicity and tender pathos which so strongly characterize former volumes of Dr. Guthrie are conspicuous in these sketches. His earnest, affectionate nature, his generous sympathy with every movement for Christ and humanity, his

large and noble charity, are impressed upon every page. The style is peculiarly his own. It is so easy and conversational that we almost forget that we hold a printed book in our hand, and seem to hear the author speaking, and to see the very things which he describes, whether it be the "Winter Gale" at Brighton, the Methodist "Watchnight" at Edinburgh, or the dying scene of the "Unforgiving and Unforgiven."

Though Dr. Guthrie is one of Scotland's most brilliant preachers, his soul, as was Chalmers's, is burdened with the condition of the ignorant and heathen masses that swarm in large cities. The first five or six years of his ministry in Edinburgh were chiefly devoted to that class of the population. Several of the sketches in the present volume introduce us to scenes in his labors in the Cowgate, which may serve to shed light upon the problem now forcing itself upon Christian minds in our own land respecting the evangelization of the same class in our midst. Chalmers, Guthrie, and Hanna, personally engaging in such lowly ministry, become an example to all Christian people of every land and name.

*Foreign Theological Publications.**

Reden an Geistliche aus der' Kirchlichen Gegenwart. Elf Conferens vorträge in den Jahren 1860–1865 gehalten. Von Dr. Louis Bernhard Ruling, Pastor Primarius zu Budissin. Hierzu als Anhang drei Aussprachen an Junglinge. 8vo., pp. 275. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1866.

The author's concluding words of introduction indicate the spirit of his volume: "There is no other salvation, either for the Church, the State, the school, the people, the family, or the individual soul, than in Jesus Christ!" The work consists of addresses delivered on public occasions, mostly pastoral conferences. While a number of the topics are of interest to the German public only, the most are of almost universal application in Protestant Christendom. Dr. Rüling has charge of a large parish, including about ten thousand souls; and since his volume is chiefly made up of discussions immediately or remotely connected with the Church in its manifold relations, his statements are entitled to careful consideration. He speaks in the light of his own experience, and his words are therefore doubly valuable. Several of the addresses have previously

* Our notices of German publications, which have hitherto been furnished by Dr. Warren, will now come from the pen of Dr. J. F. Hurst, of Bremen, author of the "History of Rationalism."

appeared in the homiletical journal, *Gesetz und Zeugniss*, but the most of them are now in print for the first time.

The work is divided into two parts. Part First contains five edifying addresses entitled, Christ is where the Spirit of Truth is; Trowel and Sword; Priest and Samaritan; Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy! How can we make this Church Conference a Holy-rood day? Part Second is occupied altogether by lectures of a higher literary order, bearing the following titles: On the Preaching required by the Times; On the Relations of the Divorce Question to Church and State; On the Relation of the School to the Church; Church or Congregation? Lutheran Observations on the Jubilee Celebration of the Heidelberg Catechism; On the Moral Condition of the Rural Population of Germany. Besides these there is an appendix, comprising three stirring addresses to young people.

The standpoint of Dr. Rüling is thoroughly orthodox, we may say *earnestly evangelical.* His lecture on the "Preaching required by the Times" is a clarion note for a higher style of pulpit ministration than Germany has been favored with for many a long, dark year. Taking up the question at the outset, "What must we preach?" he says: "God's word is our reason, and not merely by fragments but as a whole, for God's word is a unit. Here we all unite; Christ is the whole Divine Word, and therefore the prophecy concerning Christ has its fulfillment in Christ; as well the schoolmaster leading us to Christ, as the grace and truth revealed in Christ, the *whole* Christ; that is, not merely his synoptical but his Johannean form; not merely as he is reflected in Paul, but as he is reflected in Peter and James. The *whole* Christ; not merely the type, but the Redeemer; not only the Crucified, but the Risen One; not only the Prophet, but the King; not only the Man, but the God-Man!" Laying down his basis for preaching in these words, the author next describes *the necessity of preaching in such a way as the times require*, or else a large number of sermons must fail in application. Not that the Gospel should be wrested from its original shape to conform to the changes of human society, but that the method of its presentation be such as can best suit the people who hear it. In order to warn young ministers against falling beneath the dignity of their office, he calls to mind the sad case of Töscher, who preached the whole of the year 1722 on the Sovereignty of God; celebrated the first Sunday after Advent by a discourse on The Multitude of People on the Earth; third Sunday after Advent, by one on Remarkable Prospects and Views; Epiphany, by one on The Stars; second Sunday after Epiphany,

by one on Merrymaking and Masquerades; Palm Sunday, by one on All Kinds of Accidents; Easter, by one on the Growth of Plants; and on another easter day by a discourse on Remarkable Journeys. Carpzov and his successor used to enlighten their congregations by sermons on Christ as the best mechanic, the best cloth-maker, the best linen-weaver, the best lantern-maker. The preaching which Rüling would have is derived immediately from the Holy Scriptures, and is aimed directly at the heart, for its conviction, regeneration, and final salvation. We have never met in the German language a more fitting word on the diction of a preacher of the Gospel; and in transferring it, our regret is that we cannot present whole pages of the lecture for the special attention of the clerical readers of the *Quarterly*. "There should be few rules," says the doctor; "a character pervaded by Christ will certainly be able to find its diction. This style suits one, that another. I cannot prescribe much for you. I would not dare to try to speak like Harms, or Krummacher, or Ahlfeld. . . . Then I should cease to be a preacher and become a comedian. The one Gospel contains the greatest variety of expression, and we only know one general rule: that God wishes to speak through our mouth, θεωπρέπως. . . . It is God's people whom we have before us. Let us rely in the main on the promise that 'it shall be given us,' not merely τί, but also πῶς λαλήσομεν; but we should remember that not only internal and external oratorical organs, not only understanding and memory, mouth and hand, but the *whole man*, belong to the πῶς. The great thing, not merely for our day but for *all times*, still stands; wherever the Gospel is preached in the world, the preacher himself and his entire family are constantly preaching. *The life may edify without the preached word, but the preached word can never avail without the life too.* The preacher who in our time will accomplish anything—in a time which points its finger directly at the preacher—must be faultless in doctrine, irreproachable in life; he must not only be learned, he must also be converted; he must not only be *vocatus*, but also *renatus*. Without this attribute the best preaching amounts to nothing. If the preacher himself amounts to nothing, then his eloquence is *no* virtue. It must be said of us, as it was said of Basil the Martyr, 'His preaching was like thunder, because his life was the lightning that belonged to it;' or, as it was said of the Reformers, 'The truth not only thundered, but it blazed forth from themselves.'"

This whole lecture, together with two or three more in the valuable work of Dr. Rüling, are richly deserving an English translation. But as they were all called forth by the exigencies surround-

ing the German Church, as well as by many within it, we would rather know that the volume has a wide circle of readers in Germany than to hear of its appearance in an English dress. It is a worthy representative of the vigorous efforts, now happily multiplying, toward spiritual renovation; and as such we wish it great success.

Predigten über die Epistolischen Perikopen. Von Dr. Friedrich Ahlfeld, Pastor zu St. Nicolai in Leipzig. 8vo., pp. viii, 730. Halle: Muhlmann. 1867.

A bulky volume of sermons by one of the most celebrated preachers in Germany. He makes no attempt to disguise the real character of his book by giving it some name likely to lead people to think that it had never before been preached, as is now the custom in Scotland, and to some extent in the United States. It does not require a minute's time to discover the character of the book, for plain "Sermons" stands on the title-page. Sixteen years ago Dr. Ahlfeld published a volume of sermons on the Gospels, and he pleads two excuses for issuing the present one on the Epistles. The *first* is, that in the space of sixteen years he has learned a great many lessons on the care of souls and the life of the Church; the *second* is the old story of the wish of friends having had much to do with the publication of the present work. In the volume there are seventy-two sermons in all, the length of each being much shorter than most American sermons. The titles are very attractive, and might be called by severe critics fanciful, if not sometimes puerile. We give a few as specimens: The Second Leaf in the Christian's School-Book, (Rom. xiii, 8–10;) The Best Path to the New Year lies through Bethlehem, (Gal. iii, 23–29;) The Love born of the Lord is the most beautiful Flower in Christian Life, (1 Cor. xiii, 1–13;) Isaiah the first plain Christmas Messenger, (Isaiah vii, 10–16;) Three Days from Life, (John vi, 67–69, and Luke xxii, 54–62;) The Wonder Ways of the Holy Ghost, (Acts ii, 1–13;) The true Medicine to drive off the Bitterness and Danger of Sorrow, (1 Pet. v, 6–11;) A Harvest Wreath for God's Honor, (Deut. viii, 7–18.)

It would be rash to judge from such titles that the sermons which follow them are mere appeals for attention and applause. Just the reverse. The volume abounds in startling incidents, such as a large parish always furnishes; in plain and concise statements of Christian doctrine; in searching exhortation to the sleeping soul; in beautiful and touching descriptions of Christian life; and in that true pathos which is derived from a humble contempla-

tion of the Cross, and reliance on Him whose death it symbolizes. In comparing this last fruit of Dr. Ahlfeld's pulpit labors with some of his previous ones we find it in advance of them all. Take, for example, his method of division. In previous sermons he frequently adopted a rhythmical style, and sometimes at the expense of good thought as well as by doing violence to the text itself. From a volume published as late as 1860 we select his plan of a sermon on "What sort of an Impression did the first Christmas Sermon make?" (Luke ii, 15–20.) If we were to translate the heads we would of course have to destroy the meter. In answer to the question of the text they run thus:

1. Sie suchen das Kindlein in Kripp'und stall,
2. Sie breiten das Wort aus überall,
3. Sie loben Gott mit fröhlichen Schall.

Another specimen of a sermon metrically divided. The topic is, "What do you see on the Cross of Christ?" (Luke xxiii, 24–47.) The answer, containing all the divisions, is:

1. Die Liebe, die um uns wirbt,
2. Die Liebe, die für uns stirbt,
3. Die Liebe, die nie verdirbt.

We are glad to say that such a fantastic method of analyzing is rarely, if at all, adopted in this latest work of Dr. Ahlfeld. But yet we cannot say much for his skill in grasping the whole truth of a passage of Scripture. His treatment is too often one-sided. The only range of thought he gives to a sermon on Patience is to tell simply what patience does: 1. It does not desire empty honor; 2. It helps the fallen brother; 3. It bears his burden. Many a young Methodist itinerant, just entering the work of the ministry, could make a more comprehensive division than that one. As more favorable specimens of division we may name the following: Sermon on Rom. vi, 19–23, divided thus: 1. The Different Masters; 2. The Different Services; 3. The Different Rewards. Sermon on 1 Thess. iv, 13–18, thus divided: 1. He Awakens the Dead; 2. He Clothes the Living with a new Body; 3. He takes them all with him into the Kingdom of his Glory. We do not know a work which gives a fairer exhibition of the better class of sermons preached in the evangelical pulpits of Germany than this one; though we do not mean to place it beside those of Krummacher, Tholuck, and some others that we might name, in profundity of thought, or in that many-sided view of a subject for which Wesley, and in a less degree, Chalmers, were distinguished. The sermons of Dr. Ahlfeld have been read by tens of thousands, and we can only wish for the present and best volume that he has ever pub-

lished that it may be even more useful than its predecessors in awakening and edifying those for whom Christ has died.

Bibel und Natur. Vorlesungen über die Mosaische Urgeschichte und ihr Verhältniss zu den Ergebnissen der Naturforschung. Von Dr. F. Heinrich Reusch, Prof. der Theologie an der Universität zu Bonn. Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. Freiburg in Breisgau. 1866.

The question whether the Bible and science are opposed to each other has provoked much earnest discussion in late years. The work of Professor Reusch is from a Roman Catholic point of view, but it possesses an interest and value to the Protestant mind. It is an attempt to show that the so-called opposition between science and revelation is not real, but purely fanciful; and that the authority of the Scriptures, as a divine revelation, has never been shaken, and never can be disturbed by scientific investigation. The author goes through his apologetic undertaking with an earnest spirit, having adopted as his plan an explanation of that part of the Bible which is usually claimed by skeptics to be in most violent opposition to the results of science. He lays down as the basis of his discussion this principle: "The supernatural revelation has never the purpose of enriching our profane knowledge; therefore the Bible has nowhere the purpose of giving us strictly scientific information." In proof of this position a series of testimonies of both Protestant and Catholic writers is adduced with great force. But the professor does not take a depreciative view of the labors of eminent scientific investigators; in fact, the sections in "The Task of Natural Science," and "Natural Science and Faith not Enemies," are abundant in tributes to their eminent services. But at the same time he will not concede to natural science the least right to dictate on the subject of religious truth.

Fourteen lectures are devoted to the creation, and we find them pregnant with much astronomical, geological, and paleontological information. We then come to the no less valuable and interesting portion in which the deluge, the question of the origin of species, and the unity and antiquity of the human race are examined. The position which the professor assigns to the enumeration of days in the first chapter of Genesis is at least striking and novel. It is *his* method of adjusting the apparent age of the world with the claims of geology in its present stage. "The whole number of days," says he, "has no other purpose than to prepare for the first verse of the second chapter, 'and God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it;' the divine six days' work and the consequent divine Sabbath on the one side, and the week (the six

days of labor) and the Sabbath on the other, constitute a parallel. The creation week is the divine type; our week is the human copy." The religious-ethical purpose of the creation narrative is proved by the following method: "If we ask," says the author, "how long was each one of these days?" then does the Bible send us off with a simple rebuff, such as, "You are a creature of God, and you should honor your Creator by ceasing on the seventh day from all your earthly labor and business. After God had created he ceased to create; and so should you, after you have labored, cease to labor."

We regard the book of Professor Reusch as least valuable in its method of adjusting the Mosaic account of creation to the geological periods. He here fails to do strict justice to the canons of Biblical criticism; but in other respects, in its groupings of scientific results, in its good purpose, in the standpoint which it occupies, and as a real advance in this important field of inquiry, it is well worthy of all the warm commendation it has already received at the hands of the evangelical press of Germany.

Die Bedeuting der Weltschöpfung nach Natur und Schrift. Von M. Wollf. Frankfurt am Main: Heyder und Zimmer. 1866.

Another elaborate effort to make Scripture and science agree on the Mosaic account of creation. The author is convinced that if Christian faith in the biblical record be shaken, then will faith in the whole Biblical history and doctrine of redemption be destroyed. He attempts to answer two prominent objections of natural science: the first of which is *geological*, that the earth must have been in existence through very long periods; the second is *astronomical*, that the numberless stars of the immeasurable planetary world must have long existed as lights of the earth. He meets the first charge by letting the history of the earth's formation, demanded by geology, precede the six days' work of Scripture, and does not allow that the six days were long periods. He answers the second by distinguishing between heaven, in verse 1, and the firmament, (*rakiah*,) which receives (verse 8) the additional name of heaven. The firmament is not "created" as the heaven in verse 1; but is "made," that is, from materials already in existence and at hand. It is "the heaven of air and ether," which has the power of refining, and can therefore give water over the *rakiah;* that is, water which shall be borne up in airy and gaseous forms, and can give water under the *rakiah*, which appears on the earth as dew and rain. In this firmament the heavenly lights

(verse 4) appear; and by this the author understands the solar system as different from the illimitable system of the planets which he finds mentioned in Job xxxviii, 4, sqq. This is the finished world, dwelling of angels, God's throne "in the light," the heaven of our solar system, which includes our earth as a member. The great objection which we make to Mr. Wolff's work is, that it is an attempt to make Moses teach much more than he designed to teach in his record of the creation. It is an exaggeration of his purpose. In the Scriptural account there is not, which Mr. Wolff contends there is, "a hieroglyphical character and real lapidary style." Scripture loses its force when undue attempts are made to make certain parts teach that for which they were never intended. But to give an example on this point from the book before us, the author says, (p. 3,) "The germ of the later history of redemption lies buried in the mysterious beginning, and the later history of redemption is the development of this germ. It is alone by this later history of redemption that the secret beginning can be clearly known. . . . It is not sufficient to carefully prove a harmony between the Bible and natural science, for by this means we only show that the Bible also possesses a correct scientific knowledge." On page 40 the author attempts to prove that the history of the creation authenticates the doctrine of the Trinity; and on page 22 he tries to show that there is a real parallel between the history of our solar system and the history of humanity. On pp. 80, sqq., the six days' work is made to possess a symbolical-prophetical signification for the history of the kingdom of God. As an attempt to do justice to this section of sacred history as the record of inspiration, the work of Mr. Wolff deserves credit; but he must not flatter himself that the reasoning which he has adopted to solve the problem of the apparent antagonism between the Mosaic record and natural science has contributed materially to the desired result.

Was ist die Wahrheit von Jesu? Zeitfrage und Bekenntniss, von Heinrich König. Pp. 208. Leipzig: Brockhaus. 1867.

An attempt to settle the christological question so fully that it can never be raised again. But Mr. König has utterly failed in his effort. He has traveled over the whole ground from man's fall, nay, as far back as the most venturesome geologist's remotest date, down to Baur and the Tübingen school, and yet he has not given the world any valuable fruit of his long journey. His book is divided into three parts. Part First gives the standpoint, The Question and The Confession. Part Second (from the Ante-

Christian World) is divided into nine chapters, thus: Nature and History; Man; The Nations; Revelation; Deity; Priests; Types; Discussion on Pilgrims; and Palestine. Part Third (On Christianity) treats, in its eleven chapters, of Jesus Christ; His Advent; Birth; School; Personality; Development of Life; Legacy; Divisions; Paul; The Gospels; and Unity.

We have examined this work with some care in order to find out what the author designs to prove, though he had led us to understand that he purposed to tell us "the truth about Jesus." But when he says that the evangelists do not agree, but really contradict each other in their accounts of the birth of Christ, we conclude that his own attempt will hardly stand the test beside theirs. His work is rather diffuse, somewhat confused, lacks originality; and, while it will do no good, will as surely do but little harm. It will soon find its place among the unread books of the antiquarian booksellers of Germany.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Annual of Scientific Discovery: or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1866 and 1867. Exhibiting the Most Important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the Years 1865 and 1866; A List of Recent Scientific Publications, Obituaries of Eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by SAMUEL KNEELAND, A. M., M. D., Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Secretary of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, etc. New York: Sheldon & Co.

Mr. Wells, the former editor of this work, which has run so successful a career for the last fifteen years, having been appointed commissioner of the national revenue, a new editor appears, and the present volume sums up the scientific results for two years instead of one. From the greater length of the period from which the selections are made, and the great importance of the scientific advances made, the present volume possesses rather an increased than diminished interest.

First, the return of peace has diminished the amount of pages describing the products of human genius in its most terrible phase, as the artificer of the means of destruction. In the contest between the arts of attack and of defense, the advantage just now is on the side of the former, the steel projectiles and chilled shot demanding an improved machinery of resistance. The useful

mechanic arts have made some new achievements, both in invention and in the accomplishment of great works. The doctrine of the correlation of forces has gained ground. New views have opened in regard to the relations between light, heat, electricity, magnetism, and their common relation to motion. The spectrum analysis is pouring a flood of light upon the structure of the heavenly bodies. Microscopical and chemical investigations in physiology develop the fact of a similar ultimate cellular system in both vegetable and animal systems; in "the tough oak plank, the blade of grass, the lion's claw, the contracting muscle, and the thinking brain."

But the topic of highest interest to the popular mind evidently, as well as to the savan and the theologian, is furnished from the departments of geology and biology, namely, regarding the origin and antiquity of man. Mr. Kneeland, like his predecessor, decisively favors the Darwinian theory of species, and his presentation of that subject is not a judicially impartial statement of both sides, but a forensic summation of the arguments on one side.

The theory of Darwin, that species are not rigidly limited, and have not been created at various times complete and unchangeable, but have been gradually and indefinitely varied, from external circumstances, from natural efforts to accommodate themselves to surrounding changes, and from the necessity of yielding to force in the struggle for existence, has continually gained ground, and now numbers among its advocates many of the first naturalists of Europe and this country. The opponents of this theory have their strong points in accommodating definitions of a species, the phenomena of hybridity, and the non-occurrence of these changes before our eyes. If species were created as we now see them, the more we subdivide them by extended observation the more we increase the number of the supposed creations; and yet we have no well-authenticated instance of a new creation, and in no other operations of nature such a want of continuity, such a perpetually recurring creative miracle. The tendency seems to be to the belief that there are no such natural divisions as species, genera, families, etc., but that they are merely convenient terms for subdivisions, having a permanence which may outlive many generations of man, and yet which are not absolutely fixed. Such is the length of geological periods now admitted, that the phenomena of hybridity may be legitimately explained on the theory of the continuity of succession; the infecundity may just as well be due to physical differences arising from long-continued variation, as to an original organic constitution; indeed, the acknowledged degrees of hybridity are best explained on Darwin's theory. Darwin insists upon time for the changes by natural selection; and no one will pretend, at the present day, to date back the earth's history only a few thousand years. Geology teaches that hundreds of thousands of years do not limit the period of the earth's existence as an abode for living organisms. In the early days of geological science, the numerous gaps in the record of fossil forms would have been a strong argument against the theory of Darwin; certain species seemed to become extinct and new ones to appear without connecting links; but, as page after page of this geological record has been discovered, the gaps become less numerous and less abrupt, and the intermediate forms are gradually being added to form the continuous series. The more the gaps between species are filled up by the discovery of intermediate varieties, the stronger becomes the argument for transmutation, and the weaker that for successive creations; because the former view then becomes more and more consistent with

experience, and the latter more and more inconsistent with it. The investigations of Mr. Bates on the butterflies of the Amazon region, of Mr. Wallace on those of the Malay Archipelago, of Mr. B. D. Walsh on the effect of food in insects; Sir John Lubbock's diving hymenopterous insect; the discovery of Eozoon at a period inconceivably antecedent to the pre-supposed introduction of life upon the globe; the published opinions of De Candolle and Hooker in botany; the phases of resemblance to inferior orders which the embryo goes through in its development; the metamorphosis of plants, and the occurrence of rudimentary and useless organs; all supply strong evidence in favor of the derivative hypothesis. The present more quiet and uniform rate of physical changes would involve a greater degree of fixity in living forms than in the earlier periods of rapid transition. It must also be remembered that only a very small portion of the extinct forms have been preserved as fossils; were the series complete, the question would be solved, and, in the opinion of many good judges, most likely in favor of the derivative hypothesis. The opponents of continuity lay all stress upon the lost links of the paleontological chain, and none upon the few existing and altogether exceptional ones; and the worst of it is, that the chance of filling up the missing links, from the operation of destructive causes, is very small. . . . Recent discoveries in paleontology prove that man existed on this earth at a period far anterior to that commonly assigned to him. The chipped flints of the earliest races show that their condition was not that of civilization; to these rude implements succeeded more carefully shaped and polished stone weapons, then bronze was used, and, the last before the historic period, iron. Civilization, even to the extent of that of the Egyptians and the Central Americans, must have been of very slow growth; as invention is said to march with a geometrical progression, the earliest steps must have been exceedingly slow.

Time is the great element, both in the development of vegetable and animal life, and also in the progress of man from barbarism to civilization; and this must be a primary idea in the consideration of the theory of Darwin. In this relation we will conclude by quoting from the inaugural address of Mr. Grove:

"The prejudices of education, and associations with the past, are against this (Darwin's theory of the origin of species by natural selection, etc.,) as against all new views; and while, on the one hand, a theory is not to be accepted because it is new and *primâ facie* plausible, still, to this assembly, I need not say that its running counter to existing opinions is not necessarily a reason for its rejection; the *onus probandi* should rest on those who advance a new view, but the degree of proof must differ with the nature of the subject. The fair question is, Does the newly-proposed view remove more difficulties, require fewer assumptions, and present more consistency with observed facts than that which it seeks to supersede? If so, the philosopher will adopt it, and the world will follow the philosopher—after many days." He is strongly in favor of the new theory, disbelieving in *per saltum* or sudden creations, and maintains that continuity is a law of nature, the true expression of the action of Almighty Power, and that we should cease to look for special interventions of the creative act—"we should endeavor from the relics to evoke their history, and, when we find a gap, not try to bridge it over by a miracle."—Pp. 9–11.

There are, in fact, three sects or divisions of opinion among the supporters of the doctrine of "transmutation of species." There is the doctrine of "natural selection" by Darwin, as expounded in his *Origin of Species*. Second, there is the doctrine of evolution, as expounded by Herbert Spencer in his volumes in biology. And, third, are the following views of Prof. Huxley, concisely in fact disproving Darwin's view, and flinging him upon Lamarck's old theory of variation "by external influences."

Much observation must be made, and much evidence accumulated, before we can see our way to a theory of transmutation of species. The only valid, though

cardinal, objection to such a theory, is the want of evidence that a change of the kind inferred really takes place, and that so little proof of it is forthcoming, in spite of the attention which has, for many years, been anxiously directed to the subject. The nearly allied species tantalize us by a certain flexibility of type, and by their near approach to one another; but they seem rigidly to abstain from the boundary lines; and the variations that take place seem to have no special reference to an approximation to those lines, but rather to a certain power of accommodation to external circumstances, necessary for the preservation of the species. We find considerable varieties in the human species. We do not yet clearly know how to connect even these with one another, or with a common origin. Some of these are more, some less, allied to the monkey; but between the lowest of the human and the highest of the monkey there is a gap, the width of which will be differently estimated by different persons, but so wide that there has never yet been any doubt to which side any specimen should be referred. Now, if the one has been transmuted from the other, how comes it that the series has been broken, and the connecting links ceased to exist? The conditions are still favorable to the existence of the man and to the existence of the monkey; why are they not still favorable to existence of the species that have connected the one with the other? We may wonder, not only that the traces of species in past time are not forthcoming, but that the species are not now living. Moreover, we do not know that any conceivable conditions, operating through any number of years, will bring the gorilla or chimpanzee one whit nearer to man, would give them a foot more capable of bearing the body erect, a brain more capable of conceiving ideas, or a larynx more capable of communicating them. He did not think that much direct assistance has been given, by the theory of natural selection based upon the struggle for existence, ably propounded and ably defended as it has been; it has dispersed some of the fallacies and false objections which beset the idea of transmutation of species, and has so placed the question in a fairer position for discussion; but it reminds us forcibly of some of the real difficulties and objections. Though artificial selection may do much to modify species, it is rather by producing varieties than by drawing away very far from the original stock. To the former there seems no limit; but the latter is stopped by the increasing unproductiveness and unhealthiness of the individuals, by the susceptibility to disease, and the tendency to revert to the original type. So that increasing departure requires greatly increasing care; and we do not know that any amount of care and time would be sufficient to produce what might fairly be called a new species. The bringing about any marked change, by nature's selection, is shown to be very hard of proof, and has opposed to its probability the fact that the members of a species which are most unlike have the greatest tendency to pair, and are the most fertile; so that we have here, in addition to the ready reversion of modified breeds to the original stock, a law by which the growth or perpetuation of peculiarities is prevented, and a constancy given to the characters of the species. This law is more striking from its contrast with the bar that exists to the pairing of different species, and the infertility of hybrids. Within a given range, dissimilarity promotes fertility. Beyond that range, it is incompatible with it.

These, and other considerations, have always inclined him to the opinion that modifications of animal type, occurring in nature, are more likely to be the result of external influences operating upon successive generations, influencing their development, their growth, and their maturity, than of "natural selection," and the "struggle for existence."

The slight variability of animal types through long periods, the clear manner in which many of them are worked out from one another, and which increasing investigation seems to render more and more apparent, make the prospect of proving that they are educed from one another by any of the hitherto supposed processes grow more and more distant, and the feeling arises that there must be some other law at work which has escaped our detection.

Whatever be the law and forces which effect and regulate the evolution of species, they are probably of the same kind as those which are operating in the inorganic world. The orderly and definite manner in which forms and features and specific characters are given and preserved in one instance, may be assumed

to be of the same nature as in the other; and we must probably refer the fixed animal and vegetable types to influences identical with, or similar to, those by which the forms are assigned to crystals, and the stratification is given to rocks; by which the geological epochs have been determined, and the boundaries of our planetary and solar systems have been set. One cannot but think that it may be within the power of man to work out and to comprehend, in some degree at least, the principles by which these breaks in the organic and inorganic worlds, constituting as they clearly do an important feature in the plan of creation, are brought about and regulated.

All these theories will be completely refuted if Agassiz's opinion be sustained, that the entire surface of the continents was once completely enameled with glaciers. The present living system must have been originated since that *universal reign of ice.* The strong objection to this is, that the animal life beneath and above the supposed glacier period is said to be of precisely the same type, thus necessitating the supposition that an immediate re-creation of the same fauna was produced. The question waits further investigation.

Lastly, comes Du Chaillu with his gorilla, which "resembles an exaggerated caricature of a human being." His average size of brain is less than thirty cubic inches, while that of a negro is seventy-five. The gorilla's huge head is little brain and mostly bone. His natural motion is on all fours. Caught old or young, his ferocity is equally untamable. *His* depravity is unquestionably total. He will knock you down if he can while you feed him. So that, howsoever Mr. Huxley may feel toward the gorilla, the gorilla acknowledges no relationship with him.

Of *man* as a distinct nature among living beings, we have truly seen no better exposition than the following sentences by Bishop Payne, addressed to an African Methodist Conference. Both speaker and hearers had some special interest in a comprehensive yet well-defined limitation of manhood.

Mr. Huxley, of England, says that man is nothing more than a higher order of the ape or the chimpanzee. But let me tell you how you may distinguish him. He has a straight [erect] back bone that enables him to look up to heaven. No gorilla can do this—no ourang-outang. Man alone can look up to the throne of grace. If he is able to unfold his arms and spread his hands to heaven and say, "Our Father who art in heaven," *he is a man.*

History, Biography, and Topography.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. Vol. III. 12mo., pp. 510. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.

The present volume of Dr. Stevens's great work extends from 1792 to 1804. It covers a most important period of founding and

extending the denomination over North America, from the meridian period of Coke and Asbury to the margin of the present generation. We have the primary founders, whose names are traditional and distant; their immediate successors, who were familiar to the eyes of our seniors; and our seniors themselves, who "still live" in the reposeful eve of a noble life. Hence the volume, in spite of some sameness with its predecessors, has a zest of its own. This great history, with much identity has a constantly unfolding variety. Our readers are familiar with our high estimate of it as a whole; this volume is of a piece with the work.

Dr. Stevens inadvertently, we think, calls slavery a "political" question. Such it is not intrinsically; but a domestic, a personal, an ethical, a religious, and properly an ecclesiastical question. The politician, the legislature, the government, may take it into political discussion. So they may any other moral or ecclesiastical question; as temperance, Sabbath-keeping, or profane swearing. In this way during the period of the Reformation *the doctrine of justification by faith* was drawn into *political discussion. Election and reprobation* were a political question in Holland in the age of Episcopius. *Episcopacy* has more than once been a political question in England. But the fact that the secular world takes moral or religious questions, like *slavery* or *sabbatism*, into politics, *does not take them from the domain of the Church or the pulpit.* And the Church that undertakes to avoid those great questions, under the pretext of segregating itself from politics, abdicates thereby its high moral duty, and emasculates its own Christian manhood. In no sense transcending her absolute churchly *obligation to condemn sin*, whether committed by a person or a corporation, has the Methodist Episcopal Church ever been "*a political Church.*" If she has, then the Church of Wesley and Asbury, the Church of the fathers, from its foundation down at least to 1844, was "a political Church,"—*quod absurdum est.*

From her founding by the fathers until the present hour, the relations of the Methodist Episcopal Church to political affairs have been determined by her moral duties. While she has never been silent where public sin was involved, she has ever kept perfectly aloof from all non-ethical political questions, from all partisanships, from all subservient connection with political men or measures. Those at a distance who are taught to believe otherwise are greatly deceived.

The American Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1866. Embracing Political, Civil, Military, and Social Affairs; Public Documents, Biography, Statistics, Commerce, Finance, Literature, Science, Agriculture, and Mechanical Industry. Volume VI. 8vo., pp. 795. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

We regret that the late reception of this valuable historical annual prevents our being able to give it the full notice which is its due. We will merely for the present note that the religious department (furnished by Professor Schem, the most accomplished religious statistician of our day) is enlarged in amount and remarkable for its accuracy.

Belles-Lettres, Classical, and Philological.

Hymns of Faith and Hope. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. New Edition. 12mo., pp. 375. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

A beautiful setting is given by the Carters to these rare jewels of the Kelso pastor. The accomplished scholarship and high poetic power of Dr. Bonar are manifest on every page of the volume. But they alone could not have produced such noble lyrics as are found here. It needed, in addition, a profound acquaintance with the word of God, and a personal experience, in which the truths of that word become engraven upon the heart and incorporated into the life.

Not a few of these hymns are genuine war songs of the Church, full of the shout of battle and anticipation of certain triumph. They remind us of scenes in Dr. Bonar's own Scotland, where in a bloodier warfare men fought for Jesus, and from the field of conflict mounted up to eternal victory. And then, again, we find the most tender pathos and gentle, loving tones, sweet and soft as an angel's whisper. The author has for many years been familiar with the hymns of the Middle Ages, a few of which out of the many hundreds upon this subject he has published. It is to a conversation held with him on one of the hills near the Holy City, that we are indebted for Dr. Prime's beautiful edition of the old hymn, "O mother dear, Jerusalem." Several translations and imitations are given us in the present volume, but the hymns, which are original, are equally full of hope of the coming joy. At one time it is the sighing of the soul for its eternal rest; at another, the tearful moaning of absence from the Lord; and

again, it is the swelling note of triumphant expectation in full view of the

> "City of the pearl-bright portal;
> City of the jasper wall;
> City of the golden pavement;
> Seat of endless festival:
> City of Jehovah, Salem,
> City of eternity."

D. A. W.

The Poetical Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Complete Edition. 24mo., pp. 363, green and gilt. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

A diamond edition of a diamond poet: for all suffrages agree in crowning Longfellow with laureate honors. In his earlier days the wide sweep of scholarship through which his muse coursed, his appropriation of topics and styles from the literature of every clime, inspired the suspicion that he was rather a σοφός than a ποιητής; rather an inspired reproducer of others' melodies than an originator of his own—a splendid bird with a throat to let. But bring his productions, as here, into a total, and not only are we obliged to admire his world-wide compass, but to acknowledge that there is a rich originating fountain within him, and that the play of his genius is as varied as the range of his mastery of literature. So cheery a spirit, so perfect a freedom from misanthropies and bitter skepticisms, so inborn a sympathy with the beautiful and the sacred, such startling jets and novel felicities of phrase and thought, entitle him to the hearty homage of our age. His is no infidel temper. With the pieties of the Christian ages his *poetic faith*, at least, sympathizes. It may be—we know not—that with that same piety essentially brought into the realities of the present day he would acknowledge no fellowship. Yet dealing with the poet, and unknowing the man, we may say that the pure and the good may rejoice to rank this beautiful volume among the most beautiful gifts with which living genius has dowered our age.

Periodicals.

The Atlantic Monthly. **May, 1867.**

What right has a Magazine to arrogate the name that belongs to the great ocean? Is Mag a salt water animal; or does she assert, like Britannia, the dominion of the sea; or does she claim to be a

broad oceanic concern; or is it maintainable that America has more proprietorship of the *term* Atlantic than Europe? Whatever was the real reason with our Boston neighbors, the last was undoubtedly the *best* one. For in truth the *term* primordially belongs to our continent rather than to the ocean. It is the water and not the land which has *filched* the *name*. Early at least as Plato is the record that a western continent beyond sea existed whose name was Atlantis; and the ocean received its name doubtless as the trackless medium to that legendary land. Hence, should our reconstructed nation assume the unitary title ATLANTIS, there would be but the restoration of a name as well as of a nation. And, perhaps, the original assumption of a national name, as a symbol of our unity, would have prevented the popularity of the denationalizing doctrine of secession and the consequent civil war. At any rate our Boston friends were right in assuming the adjective Atlantic as the synonym of American—if they did so.

No American monthly has attained so high a literary success as the "Atlantic." Seldom has its literary superior appeared in English literature. We must confine our commendations, however, to its literary character. It counts a constellation of brilliant writers, but all of a certain sectarian hue. There is a quite as brilliant and an immensely longer catalogue of writers who never appear; some of whom we believe to be excluded because of not quite the true shade. *It is gayly, flippantly, contemptuously, exclusively rationalistic.* It is doing its fearful share in feeding the levity of the age, in loosening the ties of moral obligation, in plunging the national mind into a mental and moral chaos. So far as unbridled skepticism and rampant licentiousness become the characteristics of the coming age, those effects may be largely attributed to the religious or rather irreligious literature of which the "Atlantic" is a pre-eminent specimen. If the coming age be morally rescued it will be by the blessed counter influences which it is the polemic aim of this magazine to destroy.

In the first article of the present number Oliver Wendell Holmes, (to whom we are indebted for many a gem of true poetic thought) spreads out before the public mind a broad picture of an evangelical minister's attempts at seducing the young females of his parish. The psychological process is traced with infinitesimal minuteness in the ministerial mind. In preparing his sermons his soul is described as overcome with licentious animal excitement. The scenes of seduction, and the ecstatic half religious half amorous dialogue, are given. But his plans are defeated by the warning interposition of a fine old rationalist, who hates and curses the doc-

trines of the puritanic pulpit. Of course the gay Voltairian doctor, being an autocrat, can have it all his own way, especially at his own breakfast table! But other *tables* will freely inquire whether it is not to that same stern, puritanic pulpit that the unparalleled sexual purity of New England life in former days was not mainly due; and whether the advance of a giddy, flippant irreligion or semi-religion of the Wendell Holmes theological school is ever likely to shed a deeper purity on our social life? We are not puritan. Against some of the dogmas of the old Calvinistic school we ever enter our protest in the name of the inspired word of God; but infinitely would we prefer the sternest puritanism, which, at any rate, was a most deep and earnest *religion*, to this flashy rationalism, which makes but an equivocal pretence to being any religion at all. Dr. Holmes's theology, or rather "atheology," is epicurism. It is the theology of license. It leads to that moral condition of the public in which even marriage becomes "the sacrament of adultery." And we must frankly say that the chapters before us from his pen, taken in their full purport and purpose, are an atrocious libel to a most demoralizing end—an unequivocal *outrage!*

Some years since our autocrat told us in a very witty poem that such had been the damaging effects of some of his most desperate witticisms that he has never since dared to "be as witty as he can." We fear that this was either a poetic figment or a matter of broken resolution; for it seems to us that in every page, in every sentence, in every line, he tries his utmost strain to be witty as he can. His success is often admirable. His style is often brilliant to the highest degree of finish. At other times, as in the present case, he is rather smutty than witty. His wit is often far fetched and overstrained; and sometimes when he is to the utmost as witty as he is able, he is not half so witty as he evidently imagines.

To the Wendell Holmes school, and to Mr. Holmes himself, indeed, truth seems not a very sacred thing. He reminds us of the unscrupulous spirit of the old French encyclopedists. In his "Currents and Counter-currents" Mr. Holmes expressly and largely expounds the doctrine that a physician should violate truth for the good of his patient. When a sick person inquires of his physician what are his prospects of life or death, the doctor must be governed not by the laws of truth, but by the probable effect upon the patient's health. A sick man, a dying man, therefore, has a doubtful chance of obtaining a true answer to the most solemn of all questions from a doctor of the Holmes school. We most promptly say that we

want none of either the morals or medicines of such prescribers. Especially, at the last solemn hour, let no such professional liar approach *our* dying bed!

Pamphlets.

A Vindication of the Claim of Alexander M. Ball, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, to the Authorship of the Poem, "Rock me to Sleep, Mother." By O. A. Morse, of Cherry Valley, New York. With an Introductory Note from Luther R. Marsh. 12mo., pp. 72. New York: M. W. Dodd.

Mrs. Akers published the song "Rock me to Sleep, Mother," in a volume of her poems issued by Ticknor and Fields, and avers that she wrote it in Italy in 1860. The friends of Mr. Ball testify that he read that song, being part of a poem thrice as long, to them in 1856. As the evidence now stands they make a very clear case. The honor of Mrs. Akers is, however, saved by a psychological theory which may do very passably in the present instance, but would not be very safe to adopt in our courts.

Miscellaneous.

The Centenary Group. By C. C. Goss. New York. 1867.

The nearest semblance of a Centenary monument we have had opportunity to record is this fine pictorial. Around Wesley for a nucleus Mr. Goss has placed the photographic images of two hundred American Methodist celebrities, lay and cleric, dead and living, in concentric ellipses enlarging chronologically, until the outermost rim is composed of the men of the hour. While the style of the art is good, the accuracy of the likenesses, so far as an extensive acquaintance with the originals enables us to pronounce, is attained with remarkable success. Our Church is obliged to Mr. Goss for the enthusiastic energy with which he has secured to her memory forever so faithful a presentment of so large a number of her historic characters. The eyes of another century will gaze with interest upon this tablet. As neither botch nor sham, it may be heartily commended to the patronage of our public.

Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever. A Poem, in Twelve Books. By Edward Henry Bickersteth, M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. 12mo., pp. 447. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Homespun; or, Five and Twenty Years Ago. By Thomas Lackland. 12mo., pp. 346. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

The Word. The House of Israel. By the Author of "Wide, Wide World." 12mo., pp. 504. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Calm Hour. By L. M. M., Author of "The Fountain Sealed." 12mo., pp. 253. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.

An Elementary Treatise on American Grape Culture and Wine Making. By Peter B. Mead. Illustrated with nearly Two Hundred Engravings, drawn from Nature. 8vo., pp. 483. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

The History of Pendennis: His Fortunes and Misfortunes, and his greatest Enemy. By William Makepeace Thackeray. With Illustrations by the Author. Two volumes complete in one. 12mo., pp. 372. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Black Sheep. A Novel. By Edmund Yates, Author of "Kissing the Rod," "Land at Last," "Broken to Harness," etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Christie's Faith. By the Author of "Carrie's Confession," etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Bogatzy's Golden Treasury. 16mo., pp. 384. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

Instant Glory. With a short Biographical Notice of the late Mrs. Winslow. By Octavius Winslow, D.D. 16mo., pp. 125. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Way of Salvation plainly set forth. By Frederick J. Jobson, D.D. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter.

Serious Truths for Consideration. By Frederick J. Jobson, D.D. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter.

Visible Union with the Church of Christ. By Frederick J. Jobson, D.D. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter.

My Son, give me thine Heart. An Earnest Appeal to Sinners of all Ages and Classes in Behalf of the Claims of Jesus. Pp. 32. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.

Sabbath Chimes; or, Meditations for the Sundays of the Year. By W. Morley Punshon, M. A. 16mo., pp. 208. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1867.

Bible Teaching in Nature. By the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, Author of "First Forms of Vegetation." 12mo., pp. 344. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

The Centenary Singer. A Collection of Hymns and Tunes popular during the last One Hundred Years. Compiled by the Music Committee of the General Conference and Associated Choirs of the M. E. Church for the Sunday-School Union. 16mo., pp. 419. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1867.

Sowing the Wind. A Novel. By E. Linn Linton, Author of "Lizzie Lorton of Greyrigg." 8vo., pp. 145. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Miss Ravenel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty. By J. W. De Forest, Author of "European Aquaintance," "Seacliff," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 521. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Donald Fraser. By the Author of "Bertie Lee." 12mo., pp. 224. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby. By Charles Dickens. With Original Illustrations by S. Eytinge, Jr. 12mo., pp. 472. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

Six Lectures delivered in Exeter Hall from November 1866 to February 1867, at the Request of the Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association. 12mo., pp. 186. London: James Nisbet & Co., Berner-street. Hamilton, Adams, & Co., Paternoster Row. 1867.

Our Father's Business. By Thomas Guthrie, D.D., Editor of the "Sunday Magazine." 12mo., pp. 278. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1867.

The Bankrupt Law of the United States, 1867. With Notes, and a Collection of American and English Decisions upon the Principles and Practice of the Law of Bankruptcy. Adapted to the Use of Lawyer and Merchant. By Edwin James, of the New York Bar, and one of the Framers of the recent English Bankruptcy Amendment Act. 8vo., pp. 325. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Sunday-School Books.

Our Sunday-School Scrap Book. Edited by Rev. D. Wise, D.D., and Rev. J. H. Vincent. Pp. 118. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Use of Illustration in Sunday-School Teaching. By Rev. James M. Freeman, A.M. Pp. 48. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Blind Basket Maker Library. Four Volumes in a Box, including "Nurse Brame," "The Blind Basket Maker and his Little Daughter," "Charley and Edith," "Little Sue and her Friends." New York: Carlton & Porter.

Postponed for want of room.

Liber Librorum. Scribner & Co.

Lange's Commentary. Scribner & Co.

Bernard's Progress of Scripture Doctrine. Gould & Lincoln.

Dale on Baptizo. Draper & Halliday.

Dall's College, Court, and Market. Lee & Shepard.

Otis's Panama Railroad. Harper & Brothers.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1867.

ART. I.—PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS ON PREACHING.

TRANSLATED BY J. F. HURST, D.D., OF BREMEN.

[M. ATHANASE COQUEREL, of Paris, the father of the celebrated Rationalist of the same name, is now very old, and has stood for many years at the head of the pulpit of the Reformed Church of France. His theological position is about midway between orthodoxy and neology, some of his works exhibiting no little sympathy with what is now called the "new theology," while others (among which is a reply to Strauss's *Life of Jesus*) are more in harmony with the old evangelical confessions. While he cannot, therefore, be regarded a guide in theological opinion, his views on preaching, as an art, are of the highest value. There is no French pulpit orator of the Protestant Church whose advice is grounded upon so long and brilliant an experience. He had for a great while entertained the design of writing an elaborate history of eloquence from the standpoint of the Christian religion; but the weight of years, and the multiplicity of duties connected with his position, have put an end to this pleasing anticipation, and he contents himself with writing a little book of only practical value, designed for the younger clergy, who would excel in preaching notwithstanding every natural impediment. The title of the book is, *Observations Pratiques sur la Predication.* Cherbuliez: Paris, 1860. The following article is an extract from that work, though we confess a difficulty in deciding in favor of any one part of a little volume that is so abundant through-

out in useful suggestions, and which is singularly in harmony with the advice and usage of the most eminent Methodist preachers.]

Is there any Use in trying to Improve your Style?

"Do you think," asks one, "that advice, experiments, and the tricks of practical oratory can make an orator? Have you any faith in the pebbles of Demosthenes? Do you admit the old distinction, that if the poet is born the orator is made; and that being without the natural gifts that eloquence requires, one can succeed in becoming an orator by the most persevering study, and by adopting the wisest methods?" It has always appeared to me very easy to reply to these questions, so often propounded, and from which one can easily make a pretext for going to sleep in idleness, or for despairing of all success. I ask in reply, "Is there an art of speaking?" Yes, undoubtedly. This being so, cultivate that art if your calling leads you to make use of it. An art, whatever it may be, can be improved; and greater or less success can be achieved in it according to the faculties with which one is endowed. This labor will never be fruitless. In whatever degree you may be endowed with, or deprived of, the natural strength of mind and body which is favorable to eloquence, the study of the art will improve your speaking; and as preaching is the first duty of the ministry of our Church, this study becomes a sacred duty.

Cicero, the best judge of eloquence in ancient times, and who has written most didactic works on the art that gave him so much celebrity, has replied to these objections with great force: "If we should be wanting in certain natural gifts, or brilliance and strength of intellect, or the aid of extensive studies, let us adhere to that course in which we are able to go." *

The Danger of Imitation.

To set one's self up for a model would not only be a folly of presumption, but one of rhetoric. In regard to elocution, whatever it may be, and still more, if it be possible, in regard

* Quod si quem aut natura sua, aut illa præstantia ingenii vis forte deficiet, aut minus instructus erit magnarum artium disciplinis, teneat tamen eum cursum quem poterit.—Orat. I.

to eloquence, that is, successful eloquence, from the ordinary talent of conversation or discussion to efforts of the most vigorous oratorical character, I believe in criticisms and directions; but I do not believe in models. Nobody hears himself. Nobody sees himself in the pulpit. Nobody knows how he speaks in public, nor even in private. No mirror can reflect an orator. Look at yourself in a glass while reciting or speaking extemporaneously, and you will no longer be yourself. The image will misrepresent the reality. The care to bestow attention upon yourself will take away everything natural from your speaking, and instead of seeing yourself you will only behold a poor substitute. And why is this? For the simple reason—of which there has been experience from the first time that a man has spoken to an assembly—that if there is anything in the world that is thoroughly personal, it is elocution; it is eloquence. Buffon has said only half the truth, "The style is the man." But eloquence, or the spoken style, is perhaps still more the man; it is the complete man; the man according to his power to be, to conceive, and to express; in a word, the man such as God created him, and such as he is developed according to his native energies.* If these observations are just there are no models in the art of speaking. He who seeks them and selects them will deceive himself at the very point where the best masters make the most unfortunate copies. All imitation of eloquence results in a species of mimicry. The first condition to be fulfilled by the orator is to be himself; and if he is mediocre, or even very ordinary, his consolation and resource are, that he will at least be himself. Up to a certain point originality can serve instead of talents.

Among other dangers to which imitation is exposed, there is a special one which the imitator does not suspect: that when he would reproduce the style or elocution of another, he imitates less the good qualities of his model than the bad ones —those that are weak or excessive. And it is just these that are more prominent, attract more attention, and are more easily counterfeited. The imitator is influenced by this very facility. It often happens that the good qualities of an eminent orator

* "Do there not exist almost as many kinds of eloquence as orators?" *Nonne fore ut, quot oratores, totidem pene reperiantur genera dicendi?*—CICERO, *de Orat. iii*, 9.

are explained by his faults, and depend upon them up to a certain point. Both classes of qualities are connected, and concentrate in him. But they separate in imitation, and it comes to pass that copyists confine themselves to carefully adopting those faults of rhetoric which they would not have contracted if they had preserved the independence of their elocution. Quintilian has said, with as much judgment as justice: "Will it not be sufficient if I speak always as Cicero? Yes, verily; I shall be satisfied if I can follow him in every respect." *

I have heard of a young minister who practiced as largely as possible the method here opposed. Toward the end of his studies he had occasion to hear more than once a preacher of whom he declared himself the systematic imitator. Gestures, posture, movements of the head, inflections of the voice—he forced himself to counterfeit everything, and thus he made himself a stranger to his own oratorical art. He spoke before a sufficiently large mirror, where he labored assiduously to become unlike himself; and the time came when he believed that he had acquired an infallible success in this patient perseverance in imitation. The imitated preacher published some sermons. The imitator committed them to memory, and repeating them to his satisfaction, he flattered himself that identity of speech was at last the identity of preaching.

The result proved too truly the justness of the principle which I defend: Imitate no one, and preserve at every price —even at the price of mortifications and painful repulses at the time of your efforts—this advantage, for which nothing can compensate: *the individuality of your eloquence.*†

* Quid ergo? Non est satis omnia sic dicere, quomodo M. Tullius dixit? Mihi quidem satis esset, si omnia consequi possem.—*De Inst. Orat.*, x, 2.

† The celebrated Archbishop of Belley, who has written fifteen volumes on preaching, "wished to imitate the slow manner of preaching of Francis Le Sales, his intimate friend. He spoiled everything; but by the advice of the Saint, he resumed the rapidity which was natural to him."—*Maximes sur le ministère de la chaire*, by Gaichiès of the Oratoire, p. 33. See also the *Histoire de la Predication*, by Joly, p. 429. "The folly of imitation may descend to the most ridiculous details." Ostervald speaks of "the Protestant theological students, nearly all of whom affect to speak through the nose, because M. Amyrault, whom they take for their model, had this fault."—*De l'Exercice du Ministère sacré*, p. 24.

"One spoils himself generally in wishing to copy others too much. Genius is stifled by striving to imitate what it does not possess. From this source arise

Nature, in endowing us with features and sound of voice, seems to give this direction by never forming two human faces of perfectly the same expression, nor two human voices of exactly the same tone.

My mind goes back to the first days of my career as I write these lines. I call to mind the circumstance in which this rule of speaking with our natural faculties, whether brilliant or not, rather than with borrowed plumes, came as a revelation to my mind. In 1813, one of my first sermons was delivered before a critical body of old experts in the art; but without losing confidence, I hurled from the pulpit a real poem in prose. It was abundant in description and apostrophe, and recited with an imperturbable memory, and with a very absurd vehemence of accentuation and gesticulation; but it was very bold and very natural.* The people were surprised, and somewhat stunned; but after reflection judgment was pronounced upon me, that the sermon had been the work of an actor; that there was nothing in it to give any ground for hope; and that I had better try any other business sooner than preaching. The sentence was sufficiently severe and alarmed me; but one of my friends, who was scarcely any older than myself, approached me immediately afterward, and whispered in my ear in the familiar style of students: "Don't be disturbed; go right on. . . . You have been just what you are; that is the great essential." This expression, I say, came to me like a revelation. It has been sounding in my ears ever since; and from that day to this I have never delivered a course of lectures on eloquence without commencing it with this advice: "Be Yourself." †

all those deformities which disfigure those who leave their natural talents to take those of another. Thus so many preachers are made worse by the false methods which they borrow."—Le P. Rapin; *Traité sur l'eloquence de la chairè*, viiie réflexion.

* M. Coquerel, however, elsewhere approves of extemporaneous preaching, with careful previous preparation, as the highest and most successful style.

† [R. W. Emerson says, "Insist on yourself, never imitate. Your own gift you can present every moment, with the cumulative force of a whole life's cultivation; but of the adopted talent of another you have only an extemporaneous half-possession. The way to speak and write what shall not go out of fashion, is to speak and write sincerely. Take Sidney's maxim: 'Look in thy heart and write.' He that writes to himself writes to an eternal public."—J. F. H.]

But is not this exclusion of models stated here too sweepingly and without the

The Utility of Advice.

From the foregoing considerations an important conclusion may be deduced which forms this corollary: Just as models are dangerous, deceptive, and really impossible, so is advice useful and indispensable. Once again I will say, no preacher knows how he preaches; some one must tell him what he is. While faults of ignorance are rare in morals, they are very common in eloquence; one cannot blame himself for them; and when he tries to correct them he does not know whether he has really succeeded.

The faults that an orator contracts in his ignorance are generally those that are very properly called natural defects. They are of such a character that they can be fallen into at any moment, and a long and painful vigilance is necessary, a sort of conflict with one's self, in order to destroy them, just as a critic would point out their return.

It is desirable to apply well the preceding remarks to the two parts of eloquence whose difficulty and importance are very great; namely, gesture, and the inflections of the voice. Who can be sure, without recourse to intelligent, attentive, and severe criticism, that his gesture and accentuation are not very defective? And how many preachers injure themselves greatly, and compromise their success without even suspecting it, by their continual smiles, by certain odd motions of the arms and hands, as have become a routine; or by shouts, sudden fall of the voice, and pathetic tones, repeated to excess by inadvertence and neglect. I knew a preacher who never commenced a sentence without passing to the lowest key; and another one who was fond of quoting the passage in Isaiah, (ix, 6,) "And the government shall be upon his shoulder;" and he never quoted it without putting his hand on his own shoulder.

How many others fall into the great mistake of gesticulating by words instead of by sentences; they adopt a jerking gesticulation, which has a very unfortunate effect, and leads to cut-

proper limitations? Coquerel surely does not mean, at least he *ought not* to mean, that the young orator, may not, like the young painter or musician, be benefited by studying the performances of the best accessible masters of his art. What he does, or, we think, *should* mean, is, that no young aspirant in any art should adopt any one model entire, and try to reproduce him.—Ed.

ting up each period into as many parts as there are gesticulations. The constant repetition of these faults of elocution leads to their becoming serious errors, and is always a plain proof that good counsel has been wanting.

We may go still further, and maintain that neither propriety nor elegance of gesticulation, nor the happy use of the voice, are qualities that come of themselves, but are to be gained by correction. Each one has his gesticulation that comes to him naturally; each one has a natural accent of voice. The habitual direction of the movements of the body, the head, the chest, the arms, the hands, and even the fingers, and the habitual intonation of the voice, increase upon us, and take their shape through infancy, childhood, and youth, and inoculate themselves, so to speak, into our person before age, and study, and the exercise of the art of oratory commence. Each one thus arrives at his first attempts at eloquence when he already knows how to gesticulate in a certain manner, and after he has been accustomed to give his voice a certain sound. This accustomed gesticulation must be regulated; this voice, already formed, must be modulated. Success seems impossible if one tries to teach these portions of the art to himself; they can be learned only by the aid of practical directions.*

It is chiefly on the subject of intonations that advice may be taken with confidence. It is more easy for those who are not in the business to criticise the intonations than the gestures

* Larive, who, notwithstanding real talents, was only a weak rival of Talma, has left a curious work, entitled, *Cours de Declamation.* (Three vols. 8vo., 1804–1810.) In this work the proper accent to be taken in reciting the principal scenes in our great tragedies is indicated by underlines, which are single, double, triple, or quadruple, according to the gravity of the tone. It is difficult to believe that this work has ever taught the art of varying the inflections and making them exactly right. Here is an example:

> But I have felt no more than a horrible mixture
> Of bones and flesh dragged in the mire;
> Of flesh-scraps stained with gore, and frightful limbs,
> Over which the devouring dogs dispute.

De Dubroca's *Traité des Intonations oratoires*, (one volume, 8vo., 1810,) is a book of the same kind. It contains some excellent advice; for example: "It is a great mistake to suppose that in speaking in public one ought to lay aside his

with justice, and orators should be glad that it is thus. In the art of oratory the use of the voice is more important than gesticulation; varied, happy, and rapid inflections are the only resource against monotony of elocution—monotony, that scourge of orators. A monotonous preacher will never be eloquent, and this fault is all the more disagreeable because nothing counterbalances it, nothing compensates for it. It distills weariness from the pulpit; it invites to sleep; it destroys

ordinary voice and assume one of an altogether different kind. The pronunciation of oratorical language has everywhere been disfigured by this error." But the work afterward loses itself in such vague directions as the following: "X. Intonations which respond to the movements of the soul that is elevated. . . . XI. The soul that is cast down. . . . XII. The soul that is lifted up in advance." It is only necessary to give this additional proof that exercise, and the counsel and criticism of a kind and severe judge, are the only means of regulating the intonations and inflections of the voice.

It would be easy to cite a great many other works. I am in possession of two, among the rest, still more curious than that of Larive, and not less useless. P. Francii *Specimen Eloquentiæ exterioris ad orationem M. T. Ciceronis pro Archia accomodatum.* Groningæ, 1753. . . . *Ejusdem Specimen alterum ad orationem pro M. Marcello*, etc. In these two treatises Professor Franz, after having given thirty-nine rules on accentuation, and fifty-six on action, gesture, and the position of the body, applies these precepts to the two orations of Cicero for Archias and for Marcellus, and indicates line by line the appropriate gesticulation and tone of voice. There are rules of this character: "The fingers should be extended and not contracted, lest we should appear to be afflicted with the gout."—P. 47. Another such observation recalls the lesson of the master of philosophy to the country gentlemen: "The most brilliant vowels are A and O, and the most brilliant consonant is R; whose force and sweetness are wonderful in elocution." The quotations show sufficiently why he was more admired by his contemporaries (1645–1704) as a Latin poet than as an orator. (See the *Onomasticon* of Saxius, v, p. 247.)

The second work to which I would make allusion is that of M. Engel, of the Academy of Berlin, translated into French by Jansen, under the title of *Idées sur le Geste*, two volumes 8vo., with thirty-four illustrations representing the attitudes and gestures explained and recommended by the author. The work is to be regretted both for the sake of the writer and the engraver; it has been impossible for me to find in this book a single useful counsel. Of our older preachers who have left behind a great reputation for eloquence, I believe Le Faucheur is the only one who has written a *Traité de l'action de l'Orateur, ou de la Prononciation et du Geste*, first edition, Paris, 1657. This work has been attributed to Courart, and Ostervald has eulogized it very highly. (*De l'Exercice du Ministère sacré*, p. 69.) Everybody is acquainted with the witty satire of Sanlecque on the bad gestures of preachers; but it is not sufficiently known that, by the confession of Catholic authors, it is the work of Le Faucheur which suggested it to him. On the mistake of considering Courart the author of the Traité of Le Faucheur, see Bayle, *Dict.*, Article *Le Faucheur*, remark C.

the attention of those who strive to keep themselves awake; the words fall one after another like flakes of snow. The witty Benedict Prêvost, professor at Montauban, said to me one day concerning a monotonous preacher: "Whenever I hear his sermons it seems to me that it is snowing."

I remember that shortly after my return to Paris, after leaving the faculty of Montauban, Jean Monod, the venerable pastor with whom my family has sustained the most intimate relations from early life, and whose preaching was at once so liberal and so full of unction, invited me to come and visit him. I had scarcely taken my seat in his study before he arose, took down a volume of Saurin, opened it at the peroration of the sermon on Eternal Punishment, and said to me, "Read me that." He heard me with attention, and without interruption; and afterward addressing some encouraging words which were full of kindness, he gave me a number of critical directions on the inflections and redundancy of intonation; which advice has proved of great advantage to me, and which, though after many years, is still present to my memory.

We cannot press too much upon beginners in their career, the students of our academies, candidates for the sacred ministry, and above all upon young pastors who have to preach often, and yet have no colleague, the importance of selecting from their customary audience some friend as censor, who can be questioned frequently after the sermon concerning the remarks that have been made, the impressions that he has received, and the progress or decline that may have attracted his attention. It is useless to add that two counselors are better than one; their observations can be compared and controlled to advantage; and it is very rare that any one of our Churches, however humble, cannot count among its members some who are able to render this kind of service. Literary criticism is not needed, but rather that which is instinctive. Good sense will be sufficient.*

Sometimes the opportunity which is not afforded by the audience in winter will be presented in summer. In many of the rural parishes, during the inclement season, the people

* In the treatise of Cicero, in which Crassus has laid down the general rules of eloquence, he terminates with these words: "The first father of a family to whom you should address yourself in a circle would have made the same

of the village and the neighboring farms are the only ones present. But when spring returns, the villas of the surrounding country are again occupied by their proprietors; and these annual returns of a more cultivated population present a very valuable opportunity. If a critic, a good counselor, has been found in one of these families, it will be very useful to learn from him what your elocution has gained or lost during the course of an entire season.

The considerations now presented will perhaps be sufficient to show the uselessness of purely theoretical courses of lectures and treatises on the art of oratory.*

If there is one art above all others that is to be acquired by practice, it is this; and if this art is the most personal of all, this, where all imitation only leads to the saddest disappointments; this, whose two principal parts, gesticulation and accentuation, may be improved but not acquired—since they are already acquired, either well or badly, before study—the weakness of theory is evident. Of what service can theoretical lessons be to him who is not able alone to know whether he

reply to your questions." (*De Orat.*, i, 34. See also iii, 50 and 51.) In Brutus (xlix) Cicero says: "I desire that my eloquence be approved by the people; he who speaks in such a manner as to be approved by the multitude will necessarily be approved by educated people." (See also liii.)

Quintilian, after having compared prose composition with versification, adds: "Wise men appreciate composition by rules, and ignorant people by pleasure." (*De Inst. Orat.*, ix, 4.)

* "The precepts of the art do not delight very much unless, by constant exercise, they have grown into habits and become natural."—*Erasmus, Ecclesiastæ*, ed. of 1539, p. 138. "Eloquence is derived less from art and theory than from the habit of speaking; here, Messala, thou wilt agree with us."—*Tacitus, Dialogue on Orators*, xxxiii.

Jordano Bruno, the intrepid martyr of philosophy, burned alive at Rome by the Inquisition in 1600, had delivered a course of lectures on eloquence to the students of Wittemberg, which has been published as delivered by J. H. Alsted, (one volume, 18mo., Frankfort, 1612,) under the title of *Artificium perorandi in gratiam eorum qui eloquentiæ vim et rationem cognoscere cupiunt.* In this work Bruno proposes to analyze and complete the rules laid down by Aristotle. The work is very curious because of the alphabets, tables arranged in circles, squares, and stars, the rays or compartments of which, according to the author, have regard to the principles and sources of eloquence. But in the introduction to that part of the book that contains these tables Bruno takes care (page 98) to premise, that the greatest and most perfect eloquence is only to be found among orators themselves. It is impossible to protest more ingeniously against theory, and yet at the same time to give one.

follows them after he has received them, and who is under the necessity of asking a third person whether he properly applies them? I am so fully convinced of the justice of these views that I have considered it a duty to write these pages. The most wholesome advice is that which suggests experience; and who can be a better counselor of preachers than one of their own number?

Defects of Homiletical Instruction.

If I may be excused for a digression, this is the place to make some observations on instruction in sacred eloquence in our theological seminaries. I doubt whether this branch of education receives necessary development, and yields all the fruit that we have a right to expect. We may ask particularly if the regular and frequent exercises in the recitation and declamation of extracts from our higher literature are systematized and assiduously followed by the students? I have assisted in lessons of this character conducted at Geneva by one of the most eminent men in the academy of that city, my excellent friend Professor Munier. I was particularly struck by the method in use, and by the great utility which the students could derive from it. This method is very simple: one of the young men recites a passage in prose or verse; his fellow-students are called upon to pronounce fraternal criticism on his performance; then the professor takes his turn, and discusses the merits and faults of the declamation and of the criticisms made upon it. It would be better, perhaps, to make selections of poetry, because rhyme forces the memory to greater attention and relieves it at the same time, while prosody does not permit the substitution of one word for another. It is certain that this manner of teaching external eloquence is the only one that really does teach it; and if these exercises are not in frequent use in our theological seminaries, they ought to be introduced or multiplied. It is plain that this method is essentially practical, quite removed from all danger of imitation, and furnishing a favorable opportunity for useful advice.

It seems to me that one improvement, or rather a single addition, might be made to this system. I mean the studying, before memorizing, of the sense of each expression in the

poetical or prose extract, not only of the grammatical sense, but of that which may be called the oratorical sense. The sentiments of him who pronounced them should be discovered and defined; also the effect which he is thought to have wished to produce on him, or those who listen. Then there must be practice in order to conform the elocution to these sentiments, to these purposes which have been recognized.

Plainly, all the real shades of elocution will be thus indicated; and it may be affirmed that the true merit of elocution —of the most vehement as well as the most quiet—consists in speaking with truth. You are wrong if, in the excitement of declamation, you utter a cry of anger in the same tone with a cry of despair; or if in the calmness of elocution you express flattery in the same tone as entreaty. Here is a very simple example which will explain my thought: Orestes, charged by the Greeks to obtain from Pyrrhus the dead body of Astyanax, the revenge of whom may some day prove fatal to Greece and to Pyrrhus himself, says to the king of Epirus:

> "In fine, assure the mind of all the Greeks;
> Secure their vengeance and secure thy life."

In an oratorical sense it would be wrong to pronounce all the last line in the same tone. The first hemistich is a demand, a request; the second is advice, a notification; and a demand is not uttered in the same accent as information.

This study, if well conducted, will also show the words in which the strength of the idea is contained, and which should consequently receive the strength and shade of intonation. In the above couplet they are the two pronouns *their* and *your*, because these indicate the shade of the two arguments that the orator wishes to enforce.

Sometimes, in the best orators, the oratorical sense of a passage may be doubtful; and it is both an interesting and instructive exercise to open a discussion with beginners on this subject. Thus, in the admirable address of Mithridates to his son, it may be asked what are the sentiments that fill the soul of the old monarch, and what impression he wishes to create when he pronounces these lines:

> "The great name of Pompey makes his triumph sure;
> It is the dismay of Asia."

In reflecting on these words, we can see plainly that this confession, by such a person and under these circumstances, may be interpreted in different ways.

In a word, the delivery depends upon the sense. Theory in the study of the art of good speaking can go no further than to be of service in establishing the meaning; the rest of the study will be an exercise of the student, and instruction on the part of the teacher.

Parliamentary, Forensic, and Academical Eloquence Compared with that of the Pulpit.

Pulpit eloquence is a special eloquence, one which is quite distinct from the usual kinds, and whose conditions and difficulties can only be learned well by pastoral experience. I confess my belief that some of the first orators, after having spoken with brilliant success at the bar, on the rostrum, or from the professor's chair, do not know what it is to speak from the Christian pulpit, and form a very incorrect idea of it. For my part I will say frankly, that when I have had the opportunity of observing the difference it has appeared to me to be enormous. The art of oratory which is employed before judicial tribunals, parliaments, or audiences who hear lectures, appears to me to be distinguished by fundamental characteristics from the art that is employed in the sacred pulpit.

Although pedagogic eloquence appears at first sight proper to be put in comparison with that of the pulpit, it is too dry and doctoral, or too brilliant and too intellectual, or too light and too incisive, to permit assimilation. It would be easy to connect with these epithets proper names, whose reputation would prove nothing against the proposition I defend.

As to our jurists, the distance which separates our speaking from theirs is still greater. To explain a text of law is certainly quite a different thing from explaining a text of Scripture. The bar has a right to employ all the rhetorical tones, and to pass from one to the other almost without transition, because it treats now the gravest subjects and now the most trivial. No length is prescribed; the pleader can go to any length which his plea requires and which the court

permits. The order and divisions of his language are perfectly arbitrary, or determined by the elements of the case and the proceedings.

In civil cases it is rare that eloquence is not required to be moderate and restrain its flight, under penalty of making the disproportion too great between the interests in litigation and the language employed. In criminal cases eloquence can take a wider and more impassioned range; but the more vehement it becomes, whether in the discussion of evidence and proof or in accusing or defending the criminal, the greater is its distance from the manner of the pulpit. It is doubtful whether it is possible or proper to speak of human passions in the same language and the same accent in a court of justice as within the walls of a church. The penal code is at too great a distance from the Gospel.*

Some of the characteristics which I have mentioned belong also to parliamentary eloquence. Many considerations might be presented on this subject, but I reduce them to two remarks, which I regard as very important. The celebrated extemporaneous orations delivered on the floor of our legislative assemblies, which are read so eagerly the day after the session, were revised and corrected at leisure for the official journal. This was both a custom and a right; it was even a necessity, after having treated points so important and delicate in the midst of noise, inattention, impatience, and often of interruptions of every kind.

In the second place, the statesman in parliament has two audiences, and sometimes three. The assembly within the sound of his voice, the nation, his party and his opponents, and the different agents of the government, will all read his utterances

* MONTAIGNE has said: "The task of the lawyer is more difficult than that of the preacher; yet it is my opinion that, at least in France, we find more passable lawyers than preachers."—*Essays*, Book I, ch. x.

LA BRUYERE, after having compared the eloquence of the bar with that of the pulpit, as well as the situation of the advocate and that of the preacher, comes to this conclusion: "It is easier to preach than to plead, and more difficult to preach well than to plead well."—*Caractéres*, chap. xv. Professor J. J. Cheneviere, in his *Observations sur l'Eloquence de la Chaire*, (Geneva, 1824,) points out (p. 16, ff.) the differences which mark the eloquence of the bar; and although we would call some of these remarks somewhat too finished and ingenious, they are well worthy of being read and digested.

the next day; and in the third place, often, the foreigner, who is interested and eager in watching for words that come from so high a source and re-echo so far, will also read. It is certainly difficult to speak under these circumstances, but it is a glory of our country that they have often been an incentive to eloquence instead of impeding it, and that for a long time they have detracted nothing from its splendor. But we must remember that these circumstances are antipodal, if I dare say it, to pulpit eloquence; the former is an eloquence of the world, and that of the pulpit is not. The difference was less sensible, perhaps, for the great orators of the court of Louis XIV., who did not leave the court, so to speak, when they went into the pulpit, called as they were to preach an Advent or Lent sermon in the midst of scandals connected with brilliant adulterers, and forced to begin their sermons with the word "Sire!" But we who do not permit temporal things to shut us up so closely; we Protestants, who, preaching before a royal family convened in church, commence by saying, "My brethren!" we believe that we can say with truth that preaching is an oratorical art quite alone, and is as far removed from parliamentary eloquence as their respective spheres are different.

Art. II.—PAUL'S ARGUMENT AGAINST JUDAIC PREDESTINATION.

No other attribute has been so ignored by unbelief, repelled by disbelief, and perverted and dishonored by misbelief, as God's universal impartial Love. God has proclaimed his love as universal: men have sought to render it partial, and often merely natural. He has asserted an election of grace, which offers and insures effectual calling and infallible salvation to all, save such as personally reject the divine relief. They have invented for him an election of unmoral preference, arbitrary caprice, absolute arithmetical division, ethnological selection. Religious conceit is not confined to any particular form of theism, nor to any age. History presents few nations

which have not alternately magnified themselves into favorites and victims of their ruling divinities. Pharaoh appears never to have doubted that the gods had raised up the Egyptians as a superior race, to have dominion over other and weaker nations, to spoil and enslave them at will. It took the proud monarch a long time to learn that it was the God of the Hebrews who raised him to a throne, to show his power in him, and that his name might be declared throughout the earth. In dealing with Pharaoh, God showed, as he is evermore showing, his justice and pity in sharp contrast with the proud and unpitying gods of the heathen. Ten opportunities were given him to issue the proclamation of freedom; ten opportunities to change a threatened stroke of vengeance into a benediction. How paternal and reluctant was the dreadful justice of the Almighty!

Monotheists have been far from guiltless in this thing. They have suspected the God of the spirits of all flesh of being a respecter of persons and races. It was Satan who first insinuated, in Eden, in his last and fatally successful temptation of Eve, that the infinite Father is capable of the caprices of tyranny. The self-love of the Jews left them alternately elated with the idea of God's peculiar favor, or depressed with the conviction of his peculiar displeasure. Elation and despair are contrast states of the same character, and supervene upon two inferences from the same theology. At one time Jehovah of hosts was so absorbed and satisfied with his care of his chosen people, that all other nations were treated with indifference, or left to reap their precarious harvest of uncovenanted blessings by sufferance. At another he was so intent on vengeance, that other peoples were accounted as nothing more than instruments of his overmastering wrath, without the remotest respect to their own guilt or innocence, prosperity or distress. Thus at one period God was a reflection of their national pride, and, at another, of their mortification and misery.

Jeremiah encountered this prevalent mal-judgment among the Jews twenty-five hundred years ago, and was commanded to rebuke it, and to show such as were dishonoring God by the propagation of the theory, that their mechanical and arbitrary views of his government were every way at fault.

The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter: so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them.—Jer. xviii,1–10.

He will break and re-make the self-marred vessel upon equal and unchangeable principles of justice and grace; will glorify his sovereignty in the interests of a merciful justice, and a just and impartial mercy.

Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?—Rom. ix, 21.

Who art thou, O proud Pharisee, that repliest against God because he chooses to fulfill his eternal purpose by showing mercy "to the Gentiles also," calling from the highways and hedges the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind, and to destroy the apostates of Israel?

Ezekiel was instructed to protest with vehemence against the same blind and foolish misrepresentation.

Therefore, O thou son of man, speak unto the house of Israel; thus ye speak, saying, If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live? Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? Therefore, thou son of man, say unto the children of thy people, the righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression; as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own

righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousnesses shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity, he shall surely live, he shall not die. None of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him; he hath done that which is lawful and right; he shall surely live. Yet the children of thy people say, The way of the Lord is not equal: but as for them, their way is not equal. When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby. But if the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby. Yet ye say, the way of the Lord is not equal. O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after his ways.—Ezek. xxxiii, 10–20. See also xviii, 20–32.

Jonah was very angry that God did not keep his word of wrath with Nineveh. He attempted to flee to Tarshish at the first, because his pride and dignity shrank from the humiliation which would ensue upon the relenting of the divine heart.

So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them. For word came unto the king of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles, saying, Let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste anything; let them not feed, nor drink water: but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God; yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands. Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not? And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not. But it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry. And he prayed unto the Lord, and said, I pray thee, O Lord, was not this my saying, when I was yet in my country? Therefore I fled before unto Tarshish: for I knew that thou art a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest thee of the evil.—Jonah iii, 5–10; iv, 1, 2.

Contrast the long-suffering love of the Infinite One with the mortified vanity of the creature! Did ever poor humanity figure in an unlovelier light?

In many a vision Isaiah saw the LIGHT to the Gentiles, and the prophets caught glimpses of the coming glory. They were

charged with the maintenance of the honor of the Lord against the flagitious aspersions of fatalists and partialists alike. Nor they alone. Jesus complains of nothing else so often, as that sinners will not believe and receive his love. They will not ask largely; will not come to him and have life; will not receive him when he comes to them; close their hearts against him when he stands knocking; will not heed him when he calls. What an indictment he alleges against them on the ground that they neglect opportunities, despise the day of merciful visitation, resist the Holy Ghost, and guiltily reject a full, free, urgent, importuning salvation! It is their condemnation that light is come, and they prefer darkness; riches, and they covet poverty; pardon, and they cling to guilt. A fountain is opened, but they will not wash; a door, but they will not enter.

The apostles met the same current of dishonoring thought toward the Father of mercies. Indeed, in the beginning of their ministry, their own minds were not free from narrow and injurious opinions. It required a vision with three repetitions of its principal scene to convince Peter that Christ purposed to show mercy to any but Jews; and full explanations were necessary, afterward, to satisfy the other apostles that he had not done a rash and wicked thing in going down to the house of Cornelius.

Paul's may be taken as a representative apostolic experience, so extensive and varied was his ministry. His life as a zealous Pharisee, and his great love for the Jewish people, fitted him to reason with Jews; while his special call to be the apostle of the Gentiles made him gravely responsible for the careful and authentic indoctrination of Roman and Athenian, barbarian, Scythian, bond, and free. Add inspiration, and his qualifications are perfect.

In his epistle to the Romans this distinguished apostle enters into an elaborate argument to rescue the honor of the world's Redeemer from the injurious misconceptions of bigots, fatalists, and Pharisees. He had opened his mission fifteen years before at Antioch.

And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them

the next Sabbath. And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. But when the Jews saw the multitudes [of Gentiles] they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord; and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region.—Acts xiii, 42, 44–49.

Here, after fifteen years of experience, rugged enough to correct the excesses of early ardor, he deliberately takes up the theme of impartial grace, opening with a commanding declaration of the plenary *gracious justice* of God:

Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God.—Rom. ii, 6–11.

The Jew, who rested in the law, and made his boast of God, and knew his will, and approved the things that were more excellent, being instructed out of the law, and was confident that he himself was a guide of the blind, a light of them which were in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which had a form of knowledge and of the truth in the law, was ready to reject with detestation any views of Messiah which did not offer peculiar glory to his nation. A violent and disdainful electionist, with what unspeakable offense he must have received the apostle's assertion that the name of God was blasphemed among the Gentiles through him, and that

he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.—Rom. ii, 28, 29.

Nor did it tend to cool his anger to be told that the advantage of the Jew and the profit of circumcision lay chiefly in the fact of possessing the oracles of God. His vain conceit, that he is better by nature than other men, and therefore less in need of the remedies of grace, is repelled with great force of language.

What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.—Rom. iii, 9, 20–31.

Abraham was justified by faith while yet uncircumcised, and God is pleased, according to his eternal purpose, to extend the benefits of the covenant of faith to uncircumcised Gentile sinners.

Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised. For the promise, that he should be

the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law, be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.—Rom. iv, 7–16.

The superior advantages of the Jewish people served to aggravate their guilt, rather than to diminish their danger. Paul boldly affirms that they are no less in need of the methods of a divine mercy than the most abject Gentile tribe, and that the same redemptive economy which embraces them, is no less comprehensive and efficacious with respect to sinners of every nation.

Justification and regeneration by faith, and general redemption and free grace by Christ Jesus, as being essential to the scope of the apostle's reasoning, run through the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters. In the eighth, ninth, and eleventh the argument against pharisaic election rises to great breadth and grandeur.

The Jews angrily resented the suggestion that any but the seed of Abraham were to be admitted to the privileges of covenant and numbered with the elect. They were offended at the thought of being treated with no more consideration than other men. Flattered with the theory of an inexorable, discriminating election, as exact as mathematics, it was an unpardonable affront to these proud men, who interpreted God through their prejudice and vanity, to be told that there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek. They rejected Christ because he rebuked their profligacy, ate with publicans, and declined to erect a throne at Jerusalem. How then could they endure this new doctrine of a divine election of grace, so comprehensive as to embrace every member of the human race; offering pardon, a new heart, and eternal life to as many as, according to their light, should accept the proffered remedy! God has a sovereign right to adjust the terms of salvation. He consults not the doctors of the law, but, governed solely by the perfection of his own character, he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. If, therefore, he

chooses to receive all who come to him through Christ—to call the Gentiles, show mercy to the Samaritans, and invite from the ends of the earth the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind, hardening none save for and through their obdurate persistence in sin, as in the instance of Pharaoh—who shall find fault, and presume to arraign Almighty LOVE at the bar of human predilection? He made the covenant, and knows how to interpret it; the world, and knows how to redeem it; the souls of men, and knows how to pity and pardon them. Attempt not to shut him up to your narrow views. He redeemed all men in Christ, and in Christ offers salvation to all with equal efficaciousness and sincerity. Thus argues Paul, holding a broad view for God against Jewish exclusiveness and misinterpretation. He foreapproves, (the sense of "foreknow,") predestinates, calls, justifies, glorifies, all in sovereign independence and perfect, everlasting love, according to the purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, whom he freely gave, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.—Rom. viii, 1–4; 28–34.

It adds to the force of the argument to render the clauses of verse 34 interrogatively, according to the older Greek copies.

The point, however, is not material, as no unbiased reader will mistake the main design of the apostle. The concluding verses of the chapter add a glorious emphasis to those which we have quoted.

In the ninth chapter proof is forced home upon the Jews, to the comfort and assurance of the Gentiles, that God set their superficial and arbitrary construction of his covenant utterly at naught, even reversing the order of descent of the birthright blessing, which in their view was of the gravest importance, if not of the essence of the covenant itself. The writer again and again represents the divine sovereignty as glorifying itself by the infinitude of love, illustrating the theme by always reaching at length the (to the pharisaic mind) hated and revolting fact of the calling of the reprobate Gentiles.

For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom he hath called, not

of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Hosea, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God. What shall we say then? [as a necessary conclusion of the whole matter.] That the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling-stone; for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.—Rom. ix, 6–26, 30–32; x, 4, 10–13.

Could an argument be more triumphantly conclusive as against Pharisaic narrowness? It is a resistless defense of the ELECTION OF GRACE, which includes all in its provisions, and insures actual salvation to all who come to God through Christ, without any mental reservation or secret purpose to the contrary whatsoever. Nothing could have yielded such hope and comfort to the Gentiles, who had blasphemed God because of Jewish misrepresentations of his character; and nothing could so effectually have demolished the infinite conceit of the Jews themselves. Imagine the rage and disgust with which they heard themselves set on a level with Gentile "dogs," differing only in being more guilty by consequence of the abuse of better privileges. In the darkest days of American slavery, to have told the proudest infidel master that he was not a whit better than his negro, would have been a mild offense in comparison. That their close corporation of numerical election was to be broken up, and the choicest benefits of grace offered to Hittite and Hivite, Crete and Greek, was a doctrine which made the gospel an offense, and Christ a stone of stumbling unto them.

But Paul has not done with the theme. A perversion which originates in pride, ignorance, or despair, will reassert itself in other times and other forms. A weakness of fallen

human nature is to be treated in the light of a perpetual and universal danger. Truth must be guarded on every hand. What so improbable in advance as that the Gentile sinners, to whom Christ was to be preached, would take up the cast-off practices and prejudices of Judaism? Yet they did take them up with a most unhappy facility of imitation.

In the eleventh chapter of his epistle, the fearless teacher arraigns some Roman Gentiles, who imagined that the reprobation of the Jews was final and absolute, and that, therefore, themselves had secured a title in fee to the whole heritage of promise. As though to make his argument as comprehensive as it is cogent, he instantly arraigns these boasters, assuring them that their vauntings are not the fruit of Christ, but of their own natural hearts. Their connection with the true Olive Tree is in danger of becoming mechanical, rather than vital, as is sufficiently proved by this antichristian narrowness.

For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office; and if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in; for God is able to graff them in again.—Rom. xi, 13, 17–23.

A few years later the same admirable logician encourages the faith of the Ephesian Church by a similar process of reasoning, in which he gives prominence to the following points:

1. They were predestinated to the adoption of children by the will of God, and to the praise of his grace, according to the mystery of his eternal purpose, which was hidden although prophets foretold it, but is now revealed: which purpose is, to bring Jews and Gentiles together into one body in Christ.

2. Therefore he hath called and quickened the Ephesians,

not on a new plan, but on an eternal and changeless one, springing from his own free love, and hath abolished the enmity contained in the law of commandments. The Ephesian Church, therefore, was not built on another foundation, but on that of apostles and prophets.

3. To execute this purpose—so offensive to Jewish prejudice, and so utterly subversive of any and every doctrine of an unconditional numerical election, and of its ghastly logical counterpart, unconditional reprobation—God by revelation made known to Paul, as he had previously done to Peter, the MYSTERY OF CHRIST, which was no less, and could be no more than this: THAT THE REPROBATE GENTILES SHOULD BE FELLOW-HEIRS, AND OF THE SAME BODY, AND PARTAKERS OF HIS PROMISE IN CHRIST BY THE GOSPEL.

4. To Paul the precious grace was given to preach a free and open-armed salvation, made effectual by every purpose of Almighty Love, to sinners of every nation.

The entire argument proceeds upon the basis of a controversy, in the abstract view, between the boundless grace of God, and the impoverishing interpretations of men; and, in the concrete, between the Jewish people and the Gentile world.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved: in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.

Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.—Eph. i, 3–14; iii, 3; ii, 11–20.

For this cause, I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward: how that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words; whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel, whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, [ALL MEN SEE THE MYSTERY!] which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord: in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him. Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth,

and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.—Eph. iii, 1–21.

Without controversy the doctrine of Paul is to the praise of the glory—the manifested excellence—of divine grace.

> "Let all the world fall down and know
> That NONE BUT GOD SUCH LOVE CAN SHOW."

Behold the contrast between the election of grace and the discrimination of pharisaic prejudice and pride; the morally justifiable and most adorable election of universal LOVE, and the heartless, unpaternal, arithmetical *division* born of the pitiless spirit of *caste.*

ART. III.—CHURCH MUSIC.

THE most beautiful and attractive drapery of truth is music; the music of eloquence, of poetry, and of song. Music is the art of combining sounds that are expressive of thought, of emotion, and are agreeable to the ear. Though the term music is now restricted to the art of combining sounds in imitation of nature, yet in common life we find the germs from which it grew up. As the eye seems to be related more to the understanding, the sense of hearing has an intimate connection with the emotions. Feelings are expressed in the tones of voice.* Music is natural to man, and in the form of a science it is both vocal and instrumental, sacred and secular. The music of bird and of beast, though natural and instinctive, is not an art. It may be an imitation, yet within narrow limits, without study, without intelligent design. But when the principles on which the combinations of sounds are founded, and the causes of the emotions produced are understood, the art becomes an interesting and profound science. Music is coeval with poetry, and with equal step goes hand in hand with it. The earlier poets sang their own poems.†

* Huntington on the Fine Arts. † Jahn's Biblical Archæology.

In the order of public worship every part has its appropriate place, and contributes its portion of influence and interest. Neither prayer nor praise, reading the Scriptures nor their exposition can be omitted without a loss of interest or of instruction. Prayer and praise belong to the worshiping assembly as truly as does the hearing of the word. One person leading in vocal prayer, the congregation should silently, attentively, and devoutly join in thought, feeling, and spirit, with appropriate responses. In the exercise of vocal and public praise all who can sing, and whose hearts are attuned to the melody of sacred song, may and should sing, for a number of voices preserving the unison of time, harmony, and melody does not produce the discord nor confusion that a number engaged in extempore prayer does. On the contrary, the several parts of a tune carried forward in unison add greatly to the devotional character and power of public praise.

In this paper we propose to give a brief historic sketch of Church music, to urge the duty of Christians to unite in this part of social and public worship, and to show from a Scripture standpoint what are its true characteristics and methods.

Man is a musical being. His vocal organs are constructed both for speech in communicating ideas, and for musical tones of great variety and compass. His ear is wonderfully adapted to receive sounds, and to convey to the brain and mind the most delicate notes of tongue and of instrument. And his soul has the power of intelligently perceiving and admiring all the melodies that tongue, chord, or pipe can produce—all that the mellow and tremulous air can transmit, or the sensitive ear can receive. The vocal organs have the greatest musical power and compass. The human ear is most sensitive to musical sounds, and the soul is the spirit-sensorium of all the music of earth and sky.

> "The soul of man is larger than the sky,
> Deeper than the ocean." *

"The influence of music on the emotions of the soul is well known to every one.

> 'There is in souls a sympathy with sounds.'" †

---

* Coleridge. † Philosophy of Salvation.

It is, therefore, strongly probable that music is coeval with our race, and that in the infancy of society song aided to preserve the remembrance of historic events, as also to celebrate them. "The power of music to fix in the memory the sentiments with which it is connected, and to foster it in the heart, has been understood in all ages of the world. Some of the early legislators wrote their laws in verse, and sung them in public places. And many of the earliest sketches of primitive history are in the measures of lyric poetry. In this manner the memory was aided in retaining the facts. The ear was invited to attend to them, imagination threw around them the drapery of beauty, dignity, or power, and then music conveyed the sentiment, and mingled it with the emotions of the soul."*

The first instrument of music was probably the pipe of the shepherd, who, in his rural life, heard the wind whistle among the reeds. This was soon and naturally followed by the simplest kind of stringed instruments.† To an ordinary observer, and particularly to such careful observers and passionate admirers of nature as were the ancients, the whistling of the wind, the simplest efforts of a "rotund mouth," and the voices of zephyr breezes among forest branches and the cordage of tents, would suggest the earliest rustic instruments of sound and melody. The first mention of them precedes the deluge. Tubal, the sixth descendant from Cain, was "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ." Gen. iv, 21. About five hundred and fifty years after the deluge both vocal and instrumental music are mentioned as performed by a choir. To Jacob, who had secretly gone from Padan-Aram, and taken his dearly-bought companion and well-earned effects, Laban said, "Wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth and with *songs*, with *tabret* and with *harp?*" Gen. xxxi, 27. At least two hundred and nineteen years later, according to the usual computation, but at a much earlier date, according to Dr. Smith,‡ even before Abraham, and contemporaneous with Peleg, Job said, "The wicked take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ." Job xxi, 12. The organ of

* Philosophy of Salvation. † Huntington, Art. Music.
‡ Patriarchal Age, p. 354.

Tubal and of Job's neighbors was similar to the *syrinx* of the Greeks, a flute or a bandage of reeds of unequal length.* From those early times nothing is further said of music until Moses had made the passage of the Red Sea, when, under his guidance, the Israelites sang unto the Lord a triumphal song of deliverance. (Exod. xv, 1–19.) Immediately following this triumphal song, "Miriam, a prophetess, and sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with *timbrels* and with dances;" more properly with *flutes*, as the word rendered dances means. The timbrel was doubtless a kind of tambourine.

At this period Phœnicia and Egypt were the cradles of the arts and sciences. And from the long, and for a time familiar, associations of the Hebrews with those peoples—with the Phœnicians before the migration of Jacob and his family, and with the Egyptians both before and after their transfer to Goshen—it is not improbable that both their more accomplished science and chief instruments of music were derived from them.† However that may have been, both vocal and instrumental music constituted an important part of the religious services of the Hebrews from the time of Moses, who was both a poet and lawgiver.‡ And if the excellency of their devotional music was equal to the excellency and sublimity of Hebrew poetry, it must have been superior to that of any other people of olden times. The next reference to Hebrew music, which was chiefly sacred, was during the reign of Deborah, a prophetess, when she and Barak sang a responsive canticle, unaccompanied with instruments. (Judges, chap. v.) From 1 Sam. x, 5 we learn that music was united with prophecy—at least was used by the prophets—both on occasions of joy, as at the inauguration of Saul to be king, and in religious worship: "After that thou shalt come to the hill of God, where is the garrison of the Philistines: and it shall come to pass when thou art come thither to the city, that thou shalt meet a company of *prophets* coming down from the high place, with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them;§

* Jahn's Archæology; Brande's Encyclopedia.

† Huntington's Hebrew Music.

‡ Exod. xv; Psalm xc, *et alibi.*

§ This "high place" was probably either the place of the ark of the Lord, or the seat of a school of prophets, and therefore called "the hill of God," and at that or

and they shall prophesy." It was not until the reign of David, and after he had built a spacious and commodious tabernacle at Jerusalem, that instruments of music were somewhat permanently associated with vocal music in the public worship of God. As in Egypt the professional musicians were confined to one family, so among the Hebrews the family of Levi was exclusively consecrated to the service of God and the cultivation of this art. They were legalized choristers. In the tabernacle and in the temple they were set apart to sacred song. Under the reign of David, who from his childhood cultivated music, and was probably set apart by his parents to the prophetic office, music was more highly esteemed and cultivated as a part of religious worship. For the stability and proper observance of religious ceremonies, and in order to give the best effect to the music of the tabernacle, he appointed a large and permanent choir. The four thousand Levites were divided into twenty-four classes, who sang psalms accompanied with the music of instruments.* Each of these classes was under the direction of a leader, called the "chief musician," to whom also some of the psalms were dedicated. After the erection of the temple this arrangement was continued by Solomon, and was transmitted—there being occasional interruptions by irreligious and idolatrous kings—until the overthrow of Jerusalem.† The captivity was a severe blow to all musical ambition, effort, and culture among the Jews. Sad and mournful, even to despondency, they hung their harps on the willows lining the banks of the Euphrates, and refused to sing as in their native land. And when asked, by those who had carried them away and wasted them, to sing "one of the songs of Zion," they complied by singing a lament, which, after their deliverance, became national. (Psalm cxxxvii.) It is a beautiful dirge, the singing of which, accompanied by the Hebrew harp, must have moved the hearts of their heathen captors. From the later sacred writers, Ezra and Nehemiah, we learn that after the

some previous time was a "garrison of the Philistines." The *psaltery* was a sort of bagpipe; the *tabret* was the *toph* of the Hebrews, a sort of drum; the pipe and harp, though more rude, were similar to those of the same names in modern times.

* Jahn's Archæology. Dr. Jenks's Bib. Lit. 1 Chron. xvi, 5; xxiii, 4, 5; xxv, 1–31; 2 Chron. v, 12, 13.

† 2 Chron. xxix, 27, 28; xxxv, 15; Ezra iii, 10; Neh. xii, 45, 46.

return of the Jews from their captivity, both men and women singers were in the temple choir.*

Instrumental music in the public worship of God being first introduced by Moses, was continued thereafter until at least the rise of Christianity, when, for obvious reasons, it was for a time laid aside. Though John Baptist was a Levite, and therefore a legal chorister, yet neither our Lord nor his early disciples were of the Levitical tribe, and were not therefore professional singers in the service of God. The primitive Christians, not being countenanced by the ruling powers, worshiped in places and in a manner that forbade, as a matter of expediency and safety, the use of instruments of music, at any rate those of high artistic character. Very early, however, in the history of Christianity (the eighth century) the organ was used in divine service, which, because of its size and complexity, is in itself a musical orchestra. In the tenth book of his "Architecture," Vitruvius describes a hydraulic organ, whose bellows were worked by the fall of water. St. Jerome speaks of an organ, with twelve pairs of bellows, which might be heard at a distance of a thousand paces.†

Whatever knowledge and instruments of music the descendants of Noah possessed at the time of their dispersion were transmitted to Egypt by the family of Mizraim, and were there perpetuated, and doubtless improved, so that the Egyptians became in process of time the instructors of the Hebrews. From Phœnicia was taken into Greece, by a class of proficients in the arts and sciences called Curetes, the science of music, which at a later day was cultivated by a class of artists called Dactyli.‡ Look where we will in history, we find that the art and the instruments of sacred music are traceable to the early home of one race, and were chiefly cultivated by the people of God both in worship and in their recognition of national providences.

Not only in the temple services of the Jewish Church did sacred music hold a conspicuous place, but under the new and more spiritual dispensation vocal music was approved by the example of our Lord, who with his apostles "sang a hymn" or psalm, and then went to the Mount of Olives. (Matt. xxvi, 30.)

* Ezra ii, 65; Neh. vii, 67. † Brande's Ency., Art. Organ.

‡ Brande, Art. Music.

This hymn may have been the usual Hallel consisting of Psalms cxiii to cxviii inclusive, or possibly of "the blessing of the song."*

From the subsequent and yet early history of the more fully organized Church we learn how important a position sacred singing held, and should ever hold, in public and social worship. The prayers and singing of Paul and Silas in prison at Philippi, were both suited to their character and privileges and were instrumental in the conviction and conversion of the jailer and his family, the first fruit of apostolic labors, fidelity, and persecutions in Macedonia. That "spiritual songs," didactic, admonitory, and joyous, accompanied by instruments of music, were extant in apostolic times we learn from several passages in the New Testament; from Acts xvi, 25; 1 Cor. xiv, 6–15; Eph. v, 19, 20; Col. iii, 16; and James v, 13. Among the accusations brought by a Roman governor against the early Christians was, that they met early in the morning and sang praises to one Christ as unto a god.† That some part of the sacred music of the apostles and their immediate successors was such as was used by the Hebrews is probable. It is also probable that the music of the *hymns*, as also their versification, first used in those countries where paganism had prevailed, resembled that used in the temple worship of the Greeks and Romans.‡

In speaking of the consecration of churches throughout the Roman Empire, in the time of Constantine, Eusebius says, "there was one common consent in chanting forth the praises of God; the performance of the services was exact; the rites of the Church decent and majestic; and there was a place appointed for those who sung psalms." During this period the Ambrosian Chant was established in the Church at Milan, the influence of which was powerful on the heart of Augustine, as he entered the church soon after his conversion. It was no uncommon thing for the Gentiles to be drawn into the early churches of converted Jews through mere curiosity by the power of music.§ Similar influences are well known in the early history of Methodism.

For the perfection of modern Church music we are indebted

* Dr. Jenks's, Bib. Lit.
† 97th Epistle of Pliny.
‡ Huntington.
§ Huntington.

to Italy and Germany more than to any other countries. The Italian masters have long stood at the head of composers. The plain chant of the Church of Rome is said to owe its origin to Ambrosius, Archbishop of Milan, in the fourth century. In the sixth century Pope Gregory carried it to such a degree of perfection, that up to the present day it seems incapable of improvement, and remains one of the noblest monuments that the art has produced. The music of Italy, both sacred and profane, has taken such high rank as to be the guide and pattern for the rest of Europe. In later times, say from and after the seventeenth century, the Germans, who owe their music to the Italians, as also did the Romans owe theirs to the Greeks, have taken very high rank in this science. The writings of such men as Graun, Haydn, Mozart, Handel, and Bach, have never been surpassed. Their oratorios possess the greatest beauties and the highest degree of sublimity and pathos; such as the *Ascension* and the *Israelites* by Bach, the *Death of Jesus* by Graun, and the *Messiah* by Handel.*

The reason for the musical accomplishment of the German people of the present time is, there is no school in the country for the education of youth at which music is not taught and cultivated. In our own country a beginning has been made both in the Sunday-schools and in the public schools—great educatory powers among the people. We have all heard it told, or can remember what a powerful influence in the great religious awakenings of modern times sacred song, pathetic, earnest, and spiritual, exerted on the public mind; how it swayed their passions, and often wrought vast assemblies to a high pitch of religious enthusiasm. It may be that, because of the change in popular affairs, and of the familiarity of these animating songs, we may not look for the same emotional and powerful effects as in those days of new life in the Church, —days of novel manifestations in worship. In many respects the state of civil and religious society has changed. No human agencies nor efforts produce quite such effects now as were produced in those times and under those circumstances. Neither preaching, nor prayer, nor praise, though quite as earnest and devotional, brings about the same visible results. But they may as certainly produce great spiritual and religious

* Brande's Ency., Art. Music.

results, different in their appearances and manifestations, yet the same in their essential characteristics, if now as formerly Christians pray and sing with the spirit and with the understanding also.

After this outline history of sacred music we refer to the duty of cultivating the science and art as one important part of public worship, as also an element of devotion and praise.

Scripture authority is abundant and clear. We have it in the forms of invitation, exhortation, precept, and example. The psalms are a volume of devotional songs, well adapted to praise; far more so as they appear in King James's version, than in the inharmonious versification used by the Scotch Presbyterians, the simple reading of which is enough to banish calm seriousness, or to excite the risibilities of one unaccustomed to their introversion and bad rhetoric. The psalms of David and Asaph were sung or chanted by the Levites, to which service in part they were legally devoted. One of the fathers of the early Christian Church (St. Ambrose) says that David was chosen by God, above all other prophets, to compose the psalms for public devotion. So David devoutly says,

> "My heart is fixed, O God! my heart is fixed:
> I will sing and give praise.
> Awake up, my glory! awake, psaltery and harp!
> I myself will awake early.
> I will praise thee, O Lord! among the people:
> I will sing unto thee among the nations.*" Psa. lvii, 8, 9.

and again:

> "Praise ye the Lord!
> Praise God in his sanctuary!
> Praise him in the firmament of his power!
> * * * * * *
> Praise him with the sound of the cornet!
> Praise him with the psaltery and harp!
> Praise him with the timbrel and pipe!
> Praise him with stringed instruments and organs!
> Praise him upon the loud cymbals!
> Praise him upon the high-sounding cymbals!
> Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord!" † Psa. cl.

Rising to still higher enthusiasm, he not only calls on the angels and the tongueless sun and moon and stars to praise

* Dr. Hibbard on the Psalms. † Ibid.

God, but, throwing his thoughts into the hoped-for immortality, he says:

"Praise the Lord, O my soul!
While I live will I praise the Lord;
I will sing praises unto my God while I have any being." * Psa. cxlvi, 1, 2.

Apostolic injunctions are explicit and to the point. The thoughtful and logical St. Paul exhorts: "Be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord."

In beautiful harmony with these fervent advices we may strongly infer, from our delicate and powerful *vocal* organs—from an *ear* and *soul* for music—the duty of cultivating the art, the spirit, and the power of holy song. Our vocal organs are more truly musical than any mechanism of art. And it is a sound principle that the will of God and a corresponding duty of man are clearly indicated by the human constitution; that is, what we have an ability to do, it harmonizing with the evident design of God, who thus formed us, ought to be done. Now God has formed the vocal organs, so that they are capable of the highest degree of perfection in executing the science and art of music. The direct and logical inference is, that they should be cultivated and used in his praise. Though all persons have not the same natural nor acquired power either in degree or in variety, yet all have the same organs. As to the delicacy and compass of the organs, there is doubtless the same diversity as in other faculties of our nature. Exceptions and diversities always and everywhere exist, and in this art not without adding to the variety, harmony, and power of music. Besides the vocal organs which characterize and ennoble man, he has a delicately sensitive *ear*, enabling him to catch and to nicely discriminate the wide variety of sounds of nature—of beast and bird, of the orchestral forest, of insects and water-streams, and of man. Of these sounds his mind immediately takes cognizance, and, by means of the voice, he gives utterance to them all in the highest style of music. So perfectly has God harmonized these powers that unite in man alone

* Dr. Hibbard on the Psalms.

that they are each brought into service in executing and in appreciating the music of instrument and of voice.

But the greater faculties and more varied susceptibilities of the human *soul* furnish the best evidences that man is pre-eminently a musical being, and should therefore sing the high praises of God. In the most delicately wrought instrument, whether wind or stringed, there is no music, there is only a mechanical adaptation to it, or a fitness for it. Human intelligence and skill are required—breathing into it, touching its keys, sweeping its chords—in order to bring music out of it. But the soul is the seat and source of music and song. Our physical organs, exquisite beyond comparison, are but instruments of sound to take it in or to enunciate it. Mind is the player. Instead of being all reason, all intellect, all conscience, it has depths of feeling, tender chords of emotion, and a spiritual life, that make melody of heart, and give vent to audible utterances in the warble and trill of the tongue, in the clear and shrill tenor, and in the deep-sounding bass.

The influence of holy song and mellow music is known and somewhat appreciated by all. By its melody we are not only awakened and invited to receive the sentiments sung, but are moved to heroic deeds or to profound religious adoration and praise. Accompanied by an appropriate instrument, devotional song reaches the fountains of emotion easier and more effectively than does the simple articulation of speech, however truthful or eloquent. It is the *music* of rhetoric, of poetry, and of eloquence that gives to them any power beyond that of plain utterance. God has so formed us in harmony with the voices of earth and heaven that we may praise him with a clear voice and a glad heart; that, joining in with the universal chorus, we may move the souls of other persons, and that our own devotional feelings may find harmonious expression. Who is so dull as not to be tenderly touched by the melody of music? Whose heart is so hard as not to soften under the power of spiritual praise in song? In the light of these thoughts we see the importance and power of music both as a natural pleasure and accomplishment and as a divinely appointed means of cherishing and cultivating Christian virtues, and winning over to truth and piety the heart of the irreligious. An eminent statesman once said: "Let me make the

ballads of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws." He knew well the principles of soul-action, and how much more easily the people are swayed by the sentiment of popular songs than by statute laws. Now this marvelous power of swaying emotions, of controlling mind, and of doing good, should be cultivated and used for sacred purposes; for conveying to the heart the sublime, elevating, and holy truths of revelation, the tenderly affecting sentiments of the Gospel, the sufferings and the great reconciliation of Christ. In all the range of thought there are no themes that can furnish sentiments for devotional hymns more enrapturing than the fact and history of redemption. The song of "the Lamb that was slain and liveth again" is the hymn of the universal Church on earth, and the anthem of the redeemed in heaven.

One whose soul was attuned to holy song, invites:

> "O come, let us sing unto the Lord:
> Let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation.
> Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving,
> And make a joyful noise unto him with psalms.
> For the Lord is a great God,
> And a great king, above all gods.
> * * * * *
> O come, let us worship and bow down:
> Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." Psalm xcv.

We proceed to state from a scripture standpoint the proper manner and true characteristics of this part of divine service.

The great apostle, whose authority we have cited to authenticate the *duty* of this service, says, "I will sing with *the spirit* and with *the understanding also.*" These two ideas, "with the spirit," "with the understanding," indicate clearly the characteristics and manner of devotional song and public praise. It should be understandingly done. Music is a science, a science to be studied and acquired, the same as any other, by intellectual effort. It is a study and an art. In this as in other things, practice makes perfect. A taste for it may be cultivated; a habit may be acquired. Being neither understood nor understandingly executed, both as to the sentiment sung and the art itself, it is inharmonious and unpleasant. And though an artistic perfection in the knowledge and execution of a piece may please a critical taste, it is by no means necessary to a degree of harmony and accuracy suited to wor-

ship. And yet we all know that tune, time, harmony, and melody are important to render "praise comely." Herein, then, lies the necessity of learning by note or by the ear, if we would sing to edification and without destroying the harmony of sounds or the melody of voice.

The only strong objection to promiscuous or congregational singing in the worship of God is, the masses of the people do not know how to sing so as to preserve in unison the primary elements of music. Perhaps it need not be so, and yet so it is. Most people can learn to sing, but from a want of interest, a want of effort, and from a neglect to practice what may be known, they are unqualified for engaging "with the understanding" in this accomplished, pleasing, and profitable part of divine service. There has arisen, therefore, an urgency for choir-singing conducted by those only or chiefly who, for some reason, devote the time and thought necessary to sing understandingly. And yet it is to be feared that these worshipers are not duly appreciated. Their time and talents and means are cheerfully devoted to this accomplishment, and their qualifications—which are personally gratifying—to this service, which is for the public good. From some they receive thanks; from more they receive criticism and complainings. With others they are wrongfully the subjects of jealousy and evil speaking. Sometimes they are jealous of each other, of their relative position, and of rivalry; but not more so than other amateur artists. Who has not learned that all artists, whether in painting, statuary, poetry, or in music, are delicately strung, are sensitive, have a high and nice sense of honor, and deserve, therefore, our admiration and encouragement, as they have a right to our forbearance? Left to themselves they will harmonize, or they will promptly separate. Most of choir difficulties, however they arise, are unwisely fostered. By all—by singers and by listeners—it should be remembered that sacred song is a part of divine worship, and is promotive of earnest devotion. A habit of it should be formed, and a taste for it should be cultivated. The chief design of a choir is to lead and control the audible harmony of the praise-service of the congregation.

The importance of singing "with the understanding" derives further and confirming evidence from the scope of the argument by the apostle in his advices to the Corinthian

Church: "Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge? And even things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a *distinction* in the sounds, [tunes,] how shall it be known what is piped or harped? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? Therefore, if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he a barbarian unto me. What is it then?" That is, what is the conclusion in reference to intelligible prayer and singing? The conclusion is given in these words, "I will pray with the spirit and with the understanding, and I will sing with the spirit and the understanding also." This definite instruction harmonizes with the teachings of the same apostle given to other churches: "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Colossians iii, 16. "Be filled with the spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." Eph, v, 19. The science of music should be so understood, and the art so understandingly and accurately performed, that it shall be a means of "teaching and admonishing in psalms and hymns." The singers should "speak to each other," and to the worshiping congregation, "in spiritual songs," which they cannot well do without a knowledge of music, a distinctness of utterance, an observance of time, and a preservation of harmony.

Another important element of sacred music, as a method and medium of praise, is *spirituality:* "I will sing with the spirit." By this we understand that it should be earnest and hearty, with the soul rather than lip-service, and under the influence of the divine Spirit rather than of the spirit of art alone. It is the religious spirituality of hymns and songs that renders them devotional and suited to worship. There is a devotion to the art and its pleasures by artists, but more than this is meant by the clause "with the spirit;" by which, indeed, the apostle means the *religious and spiritual* feature of praise-service—the same as "singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord," and "making melody in your heart to the Lord."

We now see that Church music, both instrumental and vocal, should be performed by those who both appreciate the sentiment—and enter into the spirit of the words sung who praise God with soul and life, with the understanding and with the spirit. Our hymns, consisting of penitential sentiments, devout prayers, earnest invitations, hearty resolves, pure doctrines, and fervent praise, are eminently truthful, spiritual, and devotional. And they only who understand and feel them, can truly sing them "with the spirit and with the understanding also." Of this, as of every other part of divine service, intelligence and spirituality should be characteristics. "God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

"At the origin of the world," says the seraphic Payson, "all things were good, and all creation harmonized together. Angels began the chorus of praise, and the music of the spheres blended sweetly. Man was the terrestrial leader of this universal concert, and was furnished with natural and moral powers fitted for this work. His heart, in communion with God, was the seat of celestial melody, and his tongue the organ. All was love and harmony. But sin untuned the spirit-tongues of fallen angels. By one blow man's corporeal part was unstrung. His soul now became silent and insensible to true melody. The mission of Christ and the advent of the Holy Spirit were designed to restore fully the harmony and song newly begun under the first promise of grace. Then again the angels swelled the anthem of praise. And to teach man this sacred song, 'Glory to God in the highest,' is the beneficent purpose of divine providence and grace."

"Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous!
For praise is comely for the upright.
Praise the Lord with harp;
Sing unto him with the psaltery and an instrument of ten strings.
Sing unto him a new song;
Play skillfully with a loud noise." Psa. xxxiii, 1–3.

From the general tenor of this essay it is natural to inquire what ordinances and provisions Church authorities have made on this subject. As to doctrines, the principles of government, and the order of worship, enough has been written even to dogmatism and controversy. But in reference to public praise,

so far as my knowledge extends, very little that is more than advisory, very little that is authoritative and directive, has been said. Choirs are left irresponsible; and their singing is too often capricious and self-pleasing rather than devotional. In the book of government of no Church do I find any carefully prepared and authoritative instructions on this as on other parts of public worship. Those in the Presbyterian Form of Government and in the Methodist Discipline are somewhat satisfactory. In the catalogue of the names of twenty-one homilies ordered "to be diligently and distinctly read in the churches by the ministers" of the Protestant Episcopal Church, there is not one on this part of service. In the Presbyterian "Directory for Worship" is a chapter entitled "Of the Singing of Psalms," that is worthy of being transcribed entire:

1. It is the duty of Christians to praise God by singing psalms or hymns publicly in the church, as also privately in the family.
2. In singing the praises of God we are to sing with the spirit and with the understanding also; making melody in our hearts unto the Lord. It is also proper that we cultivate some knowledge of the rules of music, that we may praise God in a becoming manner with our voices as well as with our hearts.
3. The whole congregation should be furnished with books, and ought to join in this part of worship. It is proper to sing without parceling out the psalm line by line. The practice of reading the psalm line by line was introduced in times of ignorance, when many in the congregation could not read: therefore it is recommended that it be laid aside as far as convenient.
4. The proportion of the time of public worship to be spent in singing is left to the prudence of every minister; but it is recommended that more time be allowed for this excellent part of divine service than has been usual in most of our churches.*

From the fourth section we infer that "every minister" has some control of this part of worship. And yet from the *Form of Government, chap. 9, of the Church Session*, we see that the Session is charged to "maintain the spiritual government of the congregation," and "to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation."

The only other Church which, so far as I know, gives any special advices on this subject, is the Methodist Episcopal. The important question, "How shall we guard against formality in singing?" has five items in the answer, namely:

* Confession of Faith, p. 425.

"1. Choose such hymns as are proper for the occasion, and do not sing too much at once." "2. Let the tune be suited to the sentiment, and do not suffer the people to sing too slow." "3. Let due attention be given to the cultivation of sacred music." "4. Let one or more be chosen in each society to lead the singing." "5. Exhort every person in the congregation to sing."*

But in reference to any authority over this part of service, and to whom it is intrusted, not a word is said. How it is or why that the wisdom of the Church has not devised, put in form, nor authorized instructions more to our purpose, who can tell? Is it because the quadrennial Committee on Revisals have not taken it in hand? Or do the authorities wait, in this matter as in some others, for memorials from the societies, from the laity? The section entitled "The Spirit and Truth of Singing," is harmless, and has some point. But for any supervision and authority who is responsible? The injunctions and directions are explicit, though not full. But to whom are they addressed? To the preacher? Then why not say so? Are they enjoined on the "one or more chosen in each society to lead the singing?" Nothing of this kind is said. By whom are the "one or more to lead the singing" to be chosen? By the minister? A poor arrangement in an itinerant and oft-changing pastorate. By the people? Methodism knows of no such seat and source of authority. By the trustees of churches? No. And yet, strange as it may seem, these functionaries, to whom is committed the care of church property, do in some places, because forsooth an order is drawn on them for funds to pay the chorister and organist, take this responsibility! Does this right belong to the stewards? To them it might well be intrusted. Does it belong to the quarterly conference, a body of very little service in the present condition of our economy? No. The fact is, this matter of special legislation, like some others in our methodical economy, is left unmethodized. Should not this section be so modified as to give authority and direction to somebody; or should not authority and power be given *elsewhere* in the Discipline either to the preacher or to his officiary? Some ministers claim authority over the choir, not only as to the behavior by each

* Discipline, Part I, chap. iii, sec. 2.

member of it during the time of worship, but over its organization and duties; that the choirister, as truly as a class-leader, is his creature and servant. But for such a position there is assuredly no authority, except it be on the principle that whatever the clergy have not given to the laity belongs of right to them. Nothing of this is found among the "Rules for a Preacher's Conduct;" nor in the section entitled "The Duty of Preachers," nor among the "Duties of those who have the charge of circuits or stations." Almost every other subject is clearly lodged in the hands of somebody. On this there is a strange silence. From the varied and often sad experience of ministers, who, for any reason, have usurped the authority to dictate to choirs, and to settle their troubles *ex cathedra*—and from the unfortunate history of some of our Churches, and their appeal to episcopal decisions and interference, which by the way possess no authority in this matter—we judge that this whole subject should be more clearly defined. It is intimately related to the peace, prosperity, and spirituality of our Church. It is true there may be too much legislation; but not if of the right sort and to the point. Let the next General Conference wisely locate the requisite authority to control this part of worship, and the gain will be great.

In the arrangement effected of late between the Book Agents and Philip Phillips, Esq., who has the reputation of being the best music composer and singer of American Methodism, to take charge of the Musical Department of the Book Concern, and to keep our congregations and Sunday-schools supplied with fresh and attractive music, I see the beginning of a needed reform among us.

From what precedes we infer, 1. That all Christians who can should sing, either as members of the choir, or of the congregation. And we suggest that weekly rehearsals by the Church are as important in their place for the promotion of harmonious and intelligible praise in public worship as are weekly prayer, conference, or class-meetings for the promotion of personal and social piety.*

* Since writing the above I find the following sensible suggestions:

"What is the first step toward the introduction of congregational singing? We should provide hymn and tune books, and distribute them through every seat in the church.

"In such books how should the tunes be arranged for the spirit and measure of

2. It is inferred also that instrumental music accompanying the voice is not unlawful, nor in itself inexpedient in the praise-service of public worship. And yet much care and good taste should be used in the selection of instruments whose power and tone are suited to the human voice and to the place. Such are the organ, harmonium, viol, and flute, for the double purpose of leading and of concealing the defect of the vocalist.

3. It is a clear inference that any expense required to secure and maintain "praise that is pleasant and comely," either with choir and instrument, or without them, should be cheerfully borne by the congregation.

The hearty resolve of all Christians should be to "sing with the spirit, and with the understanding also."

Sacred music and devotional song, enunciating many and important religious truths, speak tenderly to the ear, persuasively to the heart, and powerfully to the conscience. Next to the word of God and prayer should this part of worship be held. It publishes God, to whom praise belongs, who tuned the living voice, gave harmony to sounds, and formed the hearing ear. It makes known the Saviour, who is worthy to receive honor and majesty—who redeemed us, "and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

the hymns? By placing three tunes on the left page, and six hymns on the page opposite, taking care that each of the six hymns is well adapted to each of the opposite tunes. One of the three tunes should be 'a good old familiar one.'

"How are we to awaken a general heartfelt interest in our hymns and tunes for praise? By holding, in connection with the church, (or prayer-meeting, where the congregation is small,) a singing-meeting every week for the purpose of learning new tunes, and for general improvement in music.

"How can congregational singing be the best and most practically carried out in our Church service? After reading the hymn let the tune be played by the organist in a plain, simple style, so as to designate the tune and its movement; then let the entire congregation join 'lustily' in singing. If there be no instrument in the church, let the chorister or the choir lead, and the whole congregation join in heartily."—PHILIP PHILLIPS, ESQ., in the *Christian Advocate*, No. 2,084.

Art. IV.—THE SURE TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY.

Past victories are justly regarded as pledges of future successes. We may not compare the work of Christianity with that of any human policy, for it is aided by a power and by modes of progress peculiar to itself. Yet it has endured so many conflicts, and so often repeated its conquests on hostile ground, that we are assured of its continued progress until the end. It is a system of truth fully tried. Both divine aid and intrinsic excellence insure its propagation. It has not lingered in the seclusion of the cloister or the study of the philosopher, but has already taken possession of the gates of enlightened nations, and elevated its standard in the view of millions degraded by darkness and idolatry. A long and eventful progression has culminated in results that seem, just now, to promise an era of vigorous activity; and the hope is warranted that it will ere long repeat the triumphs of its primitive prosperity.

The great work of Christianity is to "bring down the reign of anti-Christ, and to propagate the knowledge of salvation." It enlists in this service now not a few reformers, but many; not a few disciples, but multitudes of them; not a single college of apostles, but the whole Christian Church and its powerful agencies. Besides, the great Head of the Church is ruler over all the great movements that transpire. He can walk on the rolling billows as though they were solid ground. Political conflicts, and even the storms of war, will not interrupt but will accelerate the progress of his Gospel.

Has Christianity ever disappointed one prediction which divine prophecy has uttered concerning it? Look at its career! It began its march of triumph when it was without temples; without academic honors; without revenue; without names of worldly dignity. It was the proscribed religion in the Roman world; the victim of imperial oppression, of popular outcry, of philosophic scorn. Its votaries were outcasts from men. They were denied a place of rest, save in penal walls, the dungeon, or the catacomb. Yet Christianity then vigorously grew and expanded. It spread like living fire, and diffused as mysterious leaven, until its converts multiplied by

thousands, and province and empire yielded to its sway. Its circle of influence, at first comprising a few adherents, rapidly widened, until it became the firmest and strongest power throughout the Roman world. While everything else tended to decay, itself was still buoyant, fresh, and progressive; until, at length, the pride of the imperial eagle made obeisance to the majesty of the cross.

Christianity appeared in an age of letters, of arts, and of sciences. But these were not its arms, nor its instrumentalities. Its own divine Founder had put an honor upon *the preaching of the word* not accorded to any other instrumentality; had set the grand example of the proclamation of the loftiest truths to indiscriminate hearers; and had enforced his example in the command, "Go ye into all the world and *preach*." . . . With this vigorous and heaven-ordained instrumentality, Christianity opened to the world the promise of a new future and the pages of a better history. It reformed social systems; opened new channels of philanthropy; taught, even to the depths of society, a loftier morality; accelerated the progress of human freedom; and, through the cross, gave to dying men blessed visions of immortal life.

The systems of religion that prevailed were as old as the nation itself. Their ceremonies were mingled with the usages of society, and were sanctioned by the laws. Their creeds were recited while yet no book of the New Testament was written. But here we admire the peculiar power of the Gospel. It triumphed over the prejudices and superstitions of men. It was at once in conflict with the spirit of the world. It beat down the rites of paganism, and the revered sanctities of the Mosaic ritual. It was militant among the nations. It brought on earth an anomalous revolution, without secular strife or warfare, and gained victories of peace and righteousness by the preaching of Christ and him crucified.

Thenceforward has it pursued its grand design—no less than a vast unification of the nations into one imperial kingdom that is not of this world. Rulers and statesmen have ardently sought to solidify the elements of the particular nations to which they were severally attached; but Christianity alone

has revealed the true cosmopolitism. It proposes a great commonwealth of all human-kind. It binds all men together by the universal law of love. It obliges them in allegiance to one prophet, priest, and king. Its code of law and morals is the *magna charta* of human rights and liberties in every land beneath the sun. The benignity of its reign eclipses the splendid glories of Grecian and Roman republics; and it secures its universal sway by beating swords into plowshares, and spears into pruning-hooks.

If we turn to the example of the most polished nations, what traces of barbarity are delineated on every page of their history! what ferocity in battle! what feelings of enmity! what cruelty and bloodshed! We find, there, that the path of glory lies through rivers of blood and the desolations of war.

But where the faith of Christ is adopted, ferocity yields to a beneficient spirit, generosity replaces resentment, barbarians become civilized, and enemies are made friends. And when Christianity shall gain the reins of universal empire in this revolted world, mankind, related to each other by one blood, shall be ruled by the great Lawgiver of the universe under a single law, expressed in a single word, and that word is—LOVE.

In the best enlightened countries where the Gospel has not been received, we find that the majority of men adhere to sensualism and materialism, while the noblest and best grasp at the chimeras of rationalism as the supreme good; and all are ignorant of the true grandeur of the soul; of its high prerogatives; of its primitive privilege of communion with God; of its restoration through the mediation of Christ; and of its wondrous eternal destiny.

Christianity comes to restore this lost knowledge; to impart this forfeited spiritual life; and to touch, with hues of heaven, new conceptions of the soul's immortal destiny.

This work has been going on well-nigh two thousand years. The tenderly beneficent spirit of the Gospel has, thus long, breathed upon the world. Wide has been the field of operations; powerful the obstacles overcome; vast the results achieved; and lasting the victories of many hard-fought contests.

A glance at a few of these conquests will indicate the progress that has been made. 1. In the primitive era of Christianity, it was necessary to lay strong and deep its immovable foundations. Its doctrines were unvailed, explained, and illustrated, by apostles, confessors, and martyrs. The truth, thus proclaimed, was violently opposed, and its advocates beaten and slain. But the flames of the last stake are now forever extinguished; and the essence of gospel doctrine has become everywhere the creed of the Church. She is now ready to leave the first principles of the doctrine of Christ and to go on to perfection. Nothing stands with such solid strength as the fundamental truths of the Gospel. The most advanced stages of Christian theology more and more conform to the primitive principles of Christianity as first enunciated by the Great Head of the Church and his apostles; and the truth, so long and so powerfully assailed, has at length vanquished controversy; while the faith of the united Christian world grasps, with all the ardor of true loyalty, the essentials of Christianity. This triumph is sung by angel bands.

2. In its progress, Christianity has also passed the scholastic trial. Union with it has been ardently sought by philosophy. Numerous questions on all points of theology were suggested. The tendency of the spirit of the schools was to appeal to dialectical tests; to reduce gospel precepts to dogmatic systems; to give a reasoning guide to the apprehensions of faith; to climb to the spiritual through rationalistic theories. But, keeping on its way, the Gospel pursued its work; and, by the foolishness of preaching, saved those who believed. It demonstrated that reason was only a blind leader beyond its sphere; and that heavenly truths were far above the reach of unaided human conception. One scholastic affirmed that "Christ's sacrifice effected man's redemption by virtue of an intrinsic quality," ("*ex insito valore;*") another school maintained that "redemption was only a consequence of the counsel and design of God, who had attached the redemption of man to the price of Christ's sacrifice." The Gospel still announced with simplicity and living power, to all who believed, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners;" "He gave his life a ransom for many;" and upon this field the Gospel is more than conqueror. It proclaims the atonement of Christ as

a great fact; and calls upon all the world to wonder, believe, and be saved; to adore, without attempting to sound the depth of the mystery.

3. Christianity has also passed the era of the Reformation. No hierarchy shall ever again obscure its light and truth with traditions or theses of man's invention. The great principle of the Lutheran Reformation was, to render to the word of God alone infallibility of doctrine. That word is now forever enthroned far above all words of man. The Gospel is the rock of truth, human theories are but quicksands. The Gospel teaches that man, by nature, is in a state of alienation from God; that there is no power in himself, in priest, or in the Church, by which he can be brought into communion with the infinitely holy One; that salvation is attained only through the blood of Christ, by faith; that even this faith is, indirectly, the gift of God, man being enabled to exercise it by the aid of the divine Spirit. Salvation is, therefore, not of man; nor can he pay any price to purchase it. Dogmas of men will pass away; the truth of God will forever endure; and in an age of light, of letters, and the press, and while the divine Spirit moves upon the mighty deep of the soul, all the forces of error can never successfully resist the advance of truth, much less overthrow it; but it will ever have free course and be glorified.

4. Christianity has escaped from the fatal error of intolerance and persecution as means of propagating its doctrines. The best reformers seem to have been tinctured with this error. Luther and Calvin were not averse to it when they condemned the tenets against which it was directed. Cranmer, reckoned afterward among the martyrs of the English Church, entreated his youthful sovereign, Edward VI., to doom to the stake some persons for their opinions, because, as he thought, they were contrary to the essentials of Christianity. Jeremy Taylor was called the champion of toleration, yet see him "considering what sects ought to be tolerated." In England, during the reign of Elizabeth, intolerance and persecution were directed against the Puritans—men of conscience and religion—who differed with their countrymen chiefly on points of form and ceremony. The same measures were resorted to in Scotland against the Presbyterians, and all who would not

submit to the arbitrary sway of prelates. But there is now no more proscription, banishment, and death, for opinion's sake. Spiritual despotism has been battled down. A common sentiment enforces full toleration throughout Christendom. Everywhere in Protestant America and in Protestant Europe all may freely hold and disseminate their religious opinions, provided it be done in a manner not hostile to the peace or security of society. The light of Christianity has so reformed the sentiments of men, that in the Church and out of it, liberty of religious opinion and worship is generally defended. If there remain a vestige of the barbarous error of intolerance, it must be sought for amid the relics of tottering Rome.

5. Still another victory has been gained. It is that of religious liberty and full political toleration. Christianity no longer seeks for its warrant of promulgation in decrees of sovereigns or acts of Parliament. The individual conscience is above them all. The ministering of God's word no longer belongs to princes. Bishops are now something more than lieutenants of a temporal king. Yet the yoke of imperial servitude and alliance was not thrown off until after long years of contest, heroism, sacrifice, and trial. The statute book under the Tudors and Stuarts for half a dozen generations is filled with acts, aiming, as it is expressed, "to abolish diversity of opinions," and denouncing the penalties of fine, imprisonment, rack, and stake, against nonconformists. A mere allusion to the courts of the Star Chamber, High Commission, and other inquisitorial tribunals, that have hunted down peaceful men and women, and shamed the liberties of England with barbaric and cruel punishments, will suffice to illustrate our position. But religious liberty and progress are now moving on hand in hand, without fear of the interdict of the civil authority; and ever since the pilgrims came to our shores to inaugurate the independence of conscience, and to nourish, by heroic blood and saintly tears, the tree of civil and religious liberty, that tree has been striking down its roots deep and strong, while it has gathered bloom from the light, strength from the storm, and the ends of the earth have sought shelter under its shadow.

The all-revealing rays of the Gospel have thus chased the darkness away. "As the lightning cometh out of the east and

shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Already we have reached the era of light and activity.

We may study these facts, and many others connected with the progress of Christianity, and shall find that time's great epochs have often changed to mark its advance; that all events, as they transpire, are but a providential procession, marching on to aid the final triumph of the Gospel. "They march, too, in the beat of time, preserving their right order, and appearing, each, just when it is wanted, not before or after." * The rise and fall of empires, the march of civilization, the government of nations, and, in short, all the affairs of men, are made to subserve the interests of Christianity, and are guided with direct reference to the final ascendancy of Christ as the head of that kingdom which is not of this world.

We perceive that man has been allowed the attempts upon Christianity to destroy it at the beginning; to make it wiser by philosophy; to make it more worldly by ceremonious dress and human tradition; more noble by regal patronage, and more secular by political alliance; but do we not plainly discover that all these circumstances, so apparently antagonistic to Christianity, have not, in fact, been fatal to its success! On the Church of Christ they have had little power, except to strengthen and unite it. The risen Saviour declared, when about ascending to reign over his kingdom, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." This power "penetrates all depths of matter, heaves in the roll of the sea, administers back of thrones, tempers the courses of history," † and turns and overturns, till He whose right it is shall reign.

"Through the harsh voices of our day
A low, sweet prelude finds its way;
Mid clouds of doubt and creeds of fear,
A light is breaking, calm and clear:

That song of love, now low and far,
E'er long shall swell from star to star;
That light's the breaking day, that tips
The golden-spired Apocalypse."

Nations are beginning to awake from the sleep of ages, and to bathe their eyes in the beams of the Sun of righteousness.

* Rev. H. Bushnell, D. D. † Ibid.

Pilgrims that have wandered long in the deserts of earth, are nearing the Canaan of their hopes. Pagan tribes are learning a new song, and shall soon lift the choral of the redeemed, when this world shall be given to Him whose cross shall be the theme of every tongue and the object of every eye.

"With anthems of devotion,
Ships from the isles shall meet,
And pour the wealth of ocean,
In tribute at his feet;
For Christ shall have dominion
O'er river, sea, and shore,
Far as the eagle's pinion,
Or dove's light wing, can soar."

The prospect of that ultimate glory has kindled into rapture the vision of prophets; it has animated the songs of the Church in all ages; it was gazed on in death by the Son of God, when he endured the cross and despised the shame. If we could see with clearer sight we should discover that this wide earth where we dwell is a vast Patmos, over which are opening glorious visions of the kingdom of Christ when he shall reign from pole to pole, and love's final revelation—its blest Epiphany of triumph—shall break forth, like hidden flame, from the reclaimed affections of a converted world.

In a gallery of paintings collected and owned by one of the merchant-princes of the city of New York,* there exists a representation of the final scene in the conquest of Granada. With all the insignia of triumph and glory the Castilian sovereigns, as described by America's favorite writer, are proceeding to take possession of the ancient city of the Moors, with its mosques and temples and the gorgeous palace of the Alhambra. The sighing Moor sadly retires. Royalty, followed by a triumphant host, is passing up the hill of martyrs toward the lofty arch of the great gate of justice, where the keys of the city and of its treasures are to be delivered. A splendid escort of cavaliers, in burnished armor, leads the advance. Princes and dignitaries, glittering with diamonds, and clothed in purple, adorn the procession. A noble army follows in shining columns with flaunting banners. Warriors with tossing plumes and glittering steel heighten the display;

* Marshall O. Roberts, Esq.

while with the squadrons of the army advance a band of released Christian captives, who have languished long in Moorish dungeons; but who, now liberated, are clanking their broken chains in triumph, shedding tears of joy and singing hymns of jubilee.

Christianity is marshaling its hosts for a conquest of greater grandeur than earth has known. Its day of victory draws nigh. The great procession of triumph marches to the final jubilee. Royalty and princes move with its squadrons. Bands of delivered captives swell all its ranks. Their songs of rejoicing are wafted across continents and seas. The king of Zion shall appear in her midst, while her banners wave from every hill of martyrs. This earth, awhile revolted from God, shall surrender to his Son its temples, and treasures, and thrones. All humanity will hail the glory of that day; all humanity take up its shout of joy; and while the lambent flushes of the radiant sky blend with the richer reflections from wings of celestial choirs descending near to earth, the harmonies above and beneath shall commingle in one song: "Alleluiah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth;" for "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Art. V.—AN ITALIAN REFORMER; JEROME SAVONAROLA.

Among the numerous heralds of religious and political reform who arose during the fifteenth century, perhaps the memory of none has suffered more injustice at the hands of posterity than that of the Florentine reformer Savonarola. Regarded by his personal friends as an almost inspired and miracle-working saint, he has been branded by his foes as a demagogue priest, a hypocritical deceiver, and a deluded fanatic. In subsequent ages he has been praised or blamed, according to the different standpoints from which writers have respectively viewed him. Hailed as a herald of the Reformation by Luther and Beza, he is judged very unfavorably by Bayle and Roscoe; though the disfavor of the latter may be accounted

for from his partiality to the tyrant Lorenzo de Medici. More recently still, and since the political regeneration of Italy, the life of Savonarola has been the subject of renewed examination —in Italy by Villari, in France by Benoist and Perrens, and in Germany by Rudelbach, Hase, and the unfortunate Lenau, which latter has made him the subject of an immortal epic. Of these more recent and, doubtless, juster views of the character of this great Italian, we propose in this article to give a rapid outline, for which we are chiefly indebted to Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, Michelet's *Rénaissance*, and the *Revue des deux Mondes*.

Born of a noble family in Ferrara, September, 1452, he received the best education his age afforded, and was destined to the medical profession. But the study of Thomas Aquinas, and the spectacle of moral depravity and of reviving paganism which Italy presented in the time of the Medici, made a powerful impression on his deeply religious temperament, and determined him to a different career. While yet a child he loved solitude, and avoided the gardens of the ducal palace where the youth were accustomed to resort for recreation. In his twenty-second year, induced by his growing horror at the depravity of the Church and society of Ferrara, he fled from his paternal roof and took shelter in a Dominican cloister of Bologna. Here in seclusion and meditation he hoped to find peace and safety for his soul.

This step is very similar to that of Luther in entering the cloister at Erfurt. In neither case was there, as yet, the least tendency to dogmatical reformation; it was simply a desire to flee from temptation, and cultivate personal virtue. Writing to his father two days after his arrival at Bologna, Savonarola said: "I could not endure the fearful godlessness of the great mass of the Italian people. Everywhere I saw virtue despised and wickedness in honor. When, in answer to prayer, God condescended to show me the right way, how could I resist? O, blessed Jesus, let me rather a thousand times suffer death than oppose myself to thy will, or show myself unthankful for thy goodness." He then prayed his father to forgive him for a step which had cost him many bitter struggles, and begged his mother for her blessing.

Desiring at first to become a mere lay brother, his superiors,

however, soon discovered his uncommon talents, and directed him to the study of theology. Called before long to the duties of teacher, he expounded with great eloquence and zeal, the works of Augustine, of Thomas Aquinas, and especially the Bible. This latter he knew almost by heart, and confessed often, that to it he owed all his light and comfort. In particular was he fond of the Jewish prophets and the Apocalypse, a fact that goes far in explaining how, under the sway of deep feelings and a vivid imagination, he gradually came to believe himself as almost inspired. His early attempts in the pulpit were not very successful. At one time, under deep discouragement, he resolved to give up preaching altogether. His renown for learning had spread abroad, however, and about the year 1490 he was called to Florence and connected with the cloister of San Marco. This is the proper beginning of his efforts for political and religious reform. His two ruling thoughts were, the reformation of the Church, and the freeing of Italy.

Lorenzo de Medici was now at the zenith of his power. All his foes had died in prison, or were languishing in exile. In the midst of profound peace, the Florentines thought only of pleasure and shows, and seemed to have forgotten even the name of liberty. And yet Florence still bore the title of republic. In the fourteenth century it had surpassed all the other Italian states in power, wealth, and the arts. In the next century there arose a rich and talented merchant family, the Medici, who attained finally to princely power, and made of Florence the central point for the culture of art and classical literature. Cosmo de Medici, the Rothschild in wealth of his day, was the first of the family who exercised unlimited sway. Having guided the state for thirty-four years, he died in 1464, and was succeeded, after the short rule of his son Peter, by his grandson Lorenzo the Magnificent, in 1469. Glorious as was this period for art and letters, it was nevertheless, morally considered, a period of all-pervading and almost pagan depravity. As at the close of the Reign of Terror in France, so also here all the aspirations of the Florentines were turned in the direction of sensual and esthetic gratification. Debauchery walked abroad in open day, intrigue and murder abounded, and all religious faith seemed to have perished. The sole activity was

in the collecting of manuscripts and specimens of ancient sculpture. Lorenzo, (such was the general tenor of his daily life,) after signing the death sentence of some friend of liberty, or transacting other state business, would repair to his celebrated Platonic academy, where litanies were drawn up in honor of Socrates, or petitions sent to the pope for the canonization of Plato, and there discourse pompously of the beauty of virtue, and of the immortality of the soul. Then plunging into scenes of revelry and indulgence he would come, when wearied, to repose in the gardens of San Marco, and listen to a lecture on Art by Benvenuto Cellini, or Michael Angelo. If such was the ordinary life of the chief of the state, how much more gross was that of the uncultivated masses!

Such was the condition of things when the austere and earnest Savonarola began his lectures in the cloister of San Marco. The throng of auditors becoming too great, he changed the locality of his teaching from the cloister garden to the church, and began, in the presence of a great multitude, his exposition of the Apocalypse. His constant theme was, "The Church must be purified." In view of the fearful depravity of Florentine society, he predicted speedy judgments upon both rulers and people. While showing the shallowness and insufficiency of the secular culture of the day to meet the wants of the soul, he cried aloud and unsparingly against the corruption of the clergy and the Church. "Your sins," said he, "make me a prophet. As yet I have been but as Jonah warning Nineveh; but I tell you, unless you heed my words, I will become a Jeremiah denouncing and bewailing the desolation of Jerusalem; for God will reform his Church, and that has never taken place without blood." Without any intention of a dogmatic change, he aimed more especially to work a moral renovation, and this cause he came finally to associate intimately with the restoration of the political liberty of the state. Though carrying to excess the monkish virtues of poverty and renunciation of the world, he insisted more especially on those doctrines which were afterward elevated to their true place in theology by the Protestants, namely, that the Scriptures direct us not to the virgin and the saints, but to Christ; that priestly absolution in itself is worthless; and that salvation proceeds from a confiding surrender of the heart to

the Redeemer. Still, the preaching of Savonarola was rather that of a theocratic prophet than that of a modern pastor. "The Divine Word from the lips of Savonarola," says Mr. Roscoe, "descended not among his audience like the dews of heaven; it was the piercing hail, the sweeping whirlwind, the destroying sword."

A year after his arrival in Florence he was chosen prior of San Marco. Contrary to the general custom, he omitted, on the occasion, to pay his respects to Lorenzo de Medici. He feared the friendship of this gifted man, and regarded him as the chief obstacle to the moral renovation of the people, and to the restoration of liberty. In vain Lorenzo resorted to every means—to politeness, to cunning, to bribery—to win over the respected and influential monk. In his last sickness, when remorse was preying on his soul, knowing the hypocrisy and venality of most of the clergy, he finally bethought himself of the austere and honest Savonarola, and sent for him. Several special crimes lay heavy on the soul of the dying man; these he wished to confess. Savonarola, seated at the foot of his bed, strove to calm him and awaken hope. "God," said he, "is good; God is merciful." After a pause he continued, "There are three things necessary: first, to have a lively faith in the mercifulness of God." "I have it," said Lorenzo. "Second, to order the restitution of all unjustly obtained money." After some hesitation he bowed assent, and waited with visible anxiety for the next requirement. "Third, to restore liberty to the people of Florence." At this the tyrant, summoning all his remaining force, shrugged his shoulders with an expression of supreme disdain. Whereupon Savonarola turned away from him, and he expired a few hours afterward. He was succeeded by his son Peter, April 8, 1492, a person lacking in shrewdness and moderation. The same year the notoriously wicked Borgia mounted the papal throne with the title of Alexander VI. At first Sovonarola submitted to the government of Peter. Still he continued to preach against the wickedness of the tyrants of Italy. "I tell you," said he, "a storm will come which will shake the mountains; over the Alps will there march into Italy one like unto Cyrus of whom Isaiah writes." In this he seems to have anticipated the Italian expedition of Charles VIII. of France, which, however, resulted

in no good to Italy. From the eloquent and popular discourses which he delivered about this time, we take, as a specimen of his manner, the following short extract:

I would fain keep silence, but I cannot, for the word of God is in my heart like a burning fire. If I yield, it would consume the marrow of my bones. The princes of Italy are sent for a scourge. Behold them laying nets for souls. Their palaces are a resort of beasts and monsters; I mean that the wicked of all sorts are there, indulging their evil desires and passions. But go to Rome! Among the high prelates, poetry and declamation have taken the place of religion. In their hands are Horace and Virgil; from these they learn to guide souls. They govern the Church by astrologers, who foretell to them the hour when they are to parade on horseback, or attend to some other such trivial function. Externally their Church is beautifully furnished with gold and gems, with magnificent ceremonies and precious mitres; but must I say it? in the primitive Church the vases were of wood, and the prelates of gold. The prelates of Rome have instituted among us the feasts of Satan; they believe no longer in God, and make a mock of the mysteries of our religion. Arise, O Lord! why sleepest thou? Come and deliver thy Church from the hands of demons, tyrants, and wicked priests! O Rome, prepare thyself; the chastisement shall be terrible! Thou shalt be girded with iron, and be made to pass by the sword, the fire, and the flame. If thou desirest to be healed, renounce thy habitual food—thy pride, thy ambition, thy luxury, thy avarice; for such food is hastening thee to death. But when the anguish and the tribulation shall come, they will desire to turn to the Lord, but will not be able. O Italy, there shall come plague upon plague; the plagues of war, and famine, and pestilence; there will not be enough to bury the dead. The dead shall fill the houses, and the buriers shall traverse the streets, crying: Bring out your dead! and shall heap them on cars, make mountains of them and burn them. In the streets they shall cry, Who has dead ones? Who has dead ones? And the people shall answer, Here is my son, here is my brother, here is my husband. And still again shall they cry, Are there no more dead? Are there no more dead? O Florence, O Rome, O Italy, the time for song and feasting has ceased! You have done evil, and you have been scourged; the sword has come. Repent, therefore, do alms, pray, and remain united. O my people, what have I desired but to see thee saved? O Saviour, I turn to thee who diedst from love for us! pardon this people of Florence which turns to thee.

But this or any other single passage can give but an imperfect notion of the irresistible power of the eloquence of Savonarola.

In August, 1494, the anticipated Cyrus seemed to have come. Charles VIII. of France marched with his army across

the Apennines, not to free Florence, however, as Savonarola hoped, but to take possession of Naples. The subserviency of the government to the French so enraged the people of Florence as to occasion the flight of the family of the Medici. Though the senate declared the fugitives to be traitors, and set a price on their heads, still their adherents in Florence were yet numerous and powerful. At this juncture Savonarola called an assembly of the people in the great cathedral to consult for the welfare of the state. By general consent he was chosen as lawgiver of Florence. As a basis for the new order of society he required four things: that God should be feared, that each should prefer the good of the republic to that of himself, that a general amnesty should be proclaimed, and that a council should be established like that of Venice. Though not opposed to monarchies, he was convinced that Florence should be a republic. "God," said he, "desires to be thy sole king, O Florence, even as he was, of old, king of Israel." As a reason for giving an amnesty, he said, "The nearer a kingdom is to God so much the more is it spiritual and strong. But no one can have communion with God, who is not at peace with his neighbor." On hearing these sentiments the people cried out: "*Viva Christo, viva Firenze!*" and intrusted the enthusiastic preacher with the organization of the government according to his theocratic ideal. With the details of the constitution, however, he did not busy himself; his position was rather that of a judge in Israel, or of a Roman censor with dictatorial authority. He acted as the representative of Christ, the organ of the theocratic republic; guided it with his counsel, and breathed into it from the pulpit his own moral and religious earnestness. In fact the pulpit was his throne. It is admitted generally, and even by the unfriendly Macchiavelli, that for the period of three years his influence over the people of Florence was extraordinarily great.

With the new form of government a new spirit came over the people. Unjustly obtained property was restored; deadly enemies were reconciled; Christian love spread like fire to all ranks; secular plays, gaming, horseracing, ceased; influenced by ascetic views, many women left their husbands and retired to cloisters; popular songs gave place to the hymns of Savonarola and his scholar Benivienti; the great painter, Fra Bar-

tolomeo, threw his nude figures into the fire; fasting became a mania; the eucharist, formerly partaken of scarcely once a year, was now the daily food of the souls of the faithful; and multitudes of anxious hearers crowded to the preaching in the cathedral, over the pulpit of which was inscribed: *Jesus Christ, the king of Florence.* A contemporary said, "The whole people of Florence are become mad out of love to Christ." "And yet," answered Savonarola, "this madness for Christ's sake is the height of wisdom." Among the curious institutions of the new government were, what was called, the juvenile inquisitors. It was their business to slip into houses and seize whatever seemed to them of a sinful character—cards, bad books, musical instruments, unchaste pictures, and devote them publicly to the flames. To supply the place of the sinful pleasures to which the Florentines had so long been accustomed on the carnival, Savonarola undertook to give to their festival a color which should be moral and instructive as well as amusing. Some scenic representation, an allegory, the cortege of a Roman emperor, a pagan apotheosis, or the triumph of death was given. In the latter spectacle, the car of death was drawn by black oxen covered with gilded skulls and white crosses; the skeleton, with the scythe and hour-glass, stood erect on the car, surrounded by open graves, out of which other skeletons arose and poured forth in Italian verse sinister predictions, such as:

Così morti vedrem voi.

"We were once as you are, but you shall be as we: we are dead as you see; some day we will see you dead likewise." As the car advanced, it was surrounded and followed by thousands of children in white, and of adults dressed like children, singing or improvising Christian songs, and engaging in holy dances. To some objections to these sacred amusements, Savonarola responded by alluding to the dancing of David before the ark of the covenant, and to the seeming excess of the apostles at pentecost.

But this sudden religiousness of the people of Florence was of unhealthy and premature growth. The work was not deep and radical. It was a conversion of the affections rather than the convictions. It was the mighty personality of one grand active soul breathing itself into the multitude of easily excita-

ble and passively receptive ones. It was, therefore, destined to abate in power, and perhaps pass away entirely, as soon as its originator should lose his prestige or pass from the stage of action. And, in fact, the naturally frivolous spirit of the Florentines soon reacted against the ascetic system, and entered into a league with the pope to the downfall of Savonarola.

Designing to make Florence the center of a general Church reformation, the monk of San Marco had boldly attacked the evil in its headquarters, in the person of the shamelessly wicked Pope Alexander VI. These two diametrically different men could not long remain in peace at the head of neighboring states. The cunning pope tried at first to bring Savonarola to silence by bribery, by offering him the archbishopric of Florence and a cardinal's hat, but received in reply only, "I desire no hat nor mitre, neither great nor small. I desire only that which thou hast given to thy saints, namely death and a crown stained with my own blood." And how soon was the noble man to receive this terrible crown! The pope, foiled in every attempt to entrap the reformer, now issued, in the autumn of 1496, a brief, interdicting to him all preaching until he should be tried and exculpated from charges of heresy which now lay against him. At the same time the Franciscans, jealous of the Dominicans, to whom Savonarola belonged, brought against him the further charge that, being a professed soldier of the Lord, he yet busied himself with worldly and political affairs.

For a while Savonarola yielded and ceased to preach, but soon overpowered by the love of God and of his flock, he mounted the pulpit and gave free scope to the pent-up feelings of his great heart. Entangled in the chains of the papal system, he sought to justify his conduct without breaking with the authority of the Church. The pope was doubtless misinformed, for surely he could not wish to smother the voice of Christian love. Here is an example of the casuistry to which Savonarola was reduced:

Who has forbidden me to preach? You say, the pope. I answer, that is not true. But here are the papal briefs. I assert that they are not from the pope. You say the pope cannot err. That is true, but equally true is the proposition that a Christian, so far as he is a Christian, cannot sin; and yet many Christians do sin because they are men. Even so the pope, as such, cannot

err; whenever he errs he is not the pope; if he commands a wrong act, he does not command it as pope; consequently the wicked brief is not from the pope, it is from the devil. I must preach because God has thereto sent me.

But the evil days for Savonarola were drawing near. The wicked pope finally struck a sensitive chord—the avarice of the Florentines. Charles VIII., from whom so much had been hoped, did no good service to Florence, and soon returned to France. Florence, by still holding fast to the French alliance, awakened great displeasure among the other Italian states; and these, with the pope at the head, formed a league against Florence. In addition to this came, in June, 1497, the scourges of pestilence and famine, against which Savonarola had no remedy except the sacrifices of good works. The party of the Medici at this juncture made an attempt to recover their power, and failing, three of the chief conspirators were summarily put to death. The blood avengers of these, now so threatened the life of Savonarola, that henceforth his attendants escorted him in arms to and from the cathedral. On one occasion his sermon was interrupted by a tumult. When the pope heard of this state of things he deemed the happy moment arrived for crushing the reformatory monk. In October, 1497, he pronounced Savonarola excommunicated, forbade all Christians to associate with him, and even threatened to interdict the rites of the Church to the whole population of Florence if they would not utterly forsake him. Moreover, he declared that in case the bull of excommunication was despised, he would authorize the confiscation of all the merchandise of Florence then in foreign territory. This appeal to the covetousness of the Florentines was successful, and henceforth all that was needed was a mere pretext for sacrificing the man for whom a few months previously the fickle populace would, almost to a man, have offered up their own lives.

In defiance of the excommunication Savonarola entered the pulpit, denied the charge of heresy, declared the papal bull null, and appealed from the earthly pope to the divine Head of the Church. He then wrote to all the sovereigns of Europe, asking them to call a general Church council for the reformation of the Church, and for the removal of the wicked man who then pretended to be pope. But though acting with this

external boldness, he nevertheless was convinced that the day of his death was close at hand. Deriving inspiration from his perilous situation, he resolved to cry aloud with his might so long as his voice was not quenched. Under an oppressive consciousness of the terrible infamy of the lives of the high dignitaries of the Church, his words took almost the prophetic flight of an Isaiah. From the *Renaissance* of Michelet I extract the following sentences uttered by Savonarola about this time:

I tell you God is irritated at the corruption of the Church. The angels on their knees cry out to him, Strike, strike! The orphans and widows weep, and exclaim, We are devoured; we can no longer live! The whole Church triumphant say to Christ, Thou hast died in vain! Heaven is beginning the assault; the saints of Italy are on the side of her foes. It is they who have saddled the war horses. The Lord is assembling the saints for the battle. But whither are they going? St. Peter, hastening, cries out, Against Rome! against Rome! St. Paul and St. Gregory exclaim, To Rome! to Rome! and behind them are marching the Sword, the Pestilence, and Famine. St. John and St. Anthony say, Down, down with Florence. St. Mark says, Let us hasten against that proud city of the waters. O cruel and fatal hour! Woe to those who shall then be alive! It shall rain tempest, and fire, and flame. There will be cries and agonies which cannot be uttered, and heaven itself will be disturbed.

But in the midst of these presentiments of evil for Italy, Savonarola exhibits a sublime unconcern as to his own fate. Says he:

If you ask me in general what shall be the end of our contest, then I answer, *Victory;* but if you ask me in particular, I answer, *Torture and Death.* But this is our gain, this is our recompense. When you shall see me dead let it not trouble you. Others like me have perished before me. Before my words become a truth for the world the blood of many must needs be shed; but for each who is put to death, God will raise up seventeen in his place.

Though speaking thus with such seeming superiority to human nature, still his heart felt the anguish of profound disappointment. Though his intimate friends redoubled their fervor, yet he felt that the masses had grown cold in their love. To this sadness he gave, with the Italian simplicity, free expression in his last sermons. He exclaims, almost murmuring:

O Lord, has thou not deceived me? I have made myself a curse for thee, and thou hast made me the mark for the arrow. I asked of thee that I might not have to govern men, but thou hast willed the contrary. I rejoiced only in peace, but thou hast

brought me into these troubles of which I had no knowledge. I have entered upon this vast sea, but how shall I again reach the shore? O ungrateful Florence! I have done for thee what I would not do for my own brothers. What have I done to thee, O my people? Alas! alas! crucify me, stone me to death; I will suffer all things for my love for thee.

But if we except these slight sacrifices to human weakness, the last days of Savonarola were untarnished by any unworthy shrinking.

Finally the long-watched-for pretext for his ruin was found. In one of his excessive and highly figurative transports of eloquence, he had invoked the Lord to consume him with fire from heaven if he had preached anything but the truth. At this his foes conceived the plan of challenging him to sustain his cause by an appeal to the fiery ordeal—that last but presumptuous test to which honest Christians resorted in the middle ages for the solution of doubtful questions, believing that God would interpose miraculously in support of the just cause. For this purpose they selected for their champion one of those insane fanatics with whom the middle-age cloisters abounded, who had declared himself willing to sacrifice his life if thereby he might rid the Church of so great a heretic as Savonarola. "If he is a saint," said he, "let him dare to enter with me into the midst of the ardent flames. I shall be burned to death, but he also; and charity teaches me to purge the Church of the terrible heresiarch, even at this price." Savonarola, for his own part, declined the ordeal, but whether from a fear that it was presumptuous or from other reasons, we know not; but one of his warm friends, Domenico Bonvicini, insisted so earnestly on accepting the challenge in his stead that the perplexed reformer finally yielded assent. The infamous and atheistical pope wrote a letter heartily approving of the procedure.

On the morning of April 7, 1498, the chief public square of Florence was surrounded by an immense multitude gathered from all parts of Italy; even the roofs of the surrounding edifices were crowded with expectant beholders. In the midst of the square, and on the sides of a platform five feet high, ten feet wide, and eighty feet long, extended two long rows of wood and fagots which had been drenched with oil and pitch. It was through the entire length of the narrow two feet wide passage which separated the ranks of wood that when the

raging flames were at their height the two champions were to pass, the one immediately behind the other.

Finally, at the head of torch-bearing processions, coming from opposite quarters and chanting the psalm beginning, "*Let God arise; let his enemies be scattered,*" appeared the anxiously awaited champions—the one inspired by dark suicidal self-abnegation, the other by a childlike but misguided confidence that God would work a miracle in support of the truth. But now, just as the flames begin to rage along the terrible passage, difficulties were raised by the Franciscans, the partisans of the pope. They declared that Domenico was perhaps a sorcerer, and bore on his person some charm. On their persistent demands he was compelled to denude himself and put on clothes of their own selecting. Then Savonarola, advancing, placed in his hands the consecrated elements of the eucharist. "What!" exclaimed the Franciscans, "do you expose the Lord's body to be burned? What a scandal! What a stumbling-block to the faithful!" But Savonarola would not yield, insisting that his friend expected to be saved only through the sacred treasure which he bore. During the discussion, which occupied some hours, the anxious multitude which had crowded the square and covered the house-tops since early dawn had grown weary, and now, under the stimulus of deferred expectation and hunger, were clamoring for the horrid spectacle. At this juncture a sudden and powerful rain-storm set in, so that in a few minutes the assembled multitude was thoroughly drenched, and the hungry flames put out; and at last, night having arrived, the presiding officers dismissed the chagrined and cursing multitude.

Savonarola was lost. The whole weight of the popular disappointment and fury, unjustly enough, was thrown upon him. The charm of prestige once dispelled, the fickle populace, without culture and without conviction, quickly drifted from the extreme of reverence to that of contempt and deadly hate; though the real friends of the fallen reformer remained true to the last. On the very evening of the disappointment, Savonarola owed it to a military escort and to the sacrament which he bore in his hands that he did not fall into the hands of his foes. On the next day, Palm Sunday, his political opponents streamed in arms to the cloister of San Marco, and in

the evening began an assault which lasted till midnight. Finally Savonarola, who, disdaining all earthly weapons, had lain all this time absorbed in prayer, came forth and gave himself up to his foes, and was dragged to prison. Two hundred of his partisans were now expelled from the great national council, and himself handed over to an extraordinary tribunal for trial. Seven different times during Holy Week was he stretched upon the terrible rack of torture. Of what he uttered in this dark secret chamber, when writhing in the jaws of worse than death, we know nothing certainly except this heart-rending shriek which pierced the walls: "*It is enough; O Lord, take now my soul.*" Cast a second time into prison, he threw himself wholly into the arms of God, and wrote a beautiful exposition of the fifty-first psalm. The pope, having asked in vain that Savonarola be sent to Rome, now appointed a clerical commission to try him on the part of the Church, and is said to have declared that he must die, even if he were a John the Baptist. According to the report of both trials he is said, whether truly or not no one knows, to have confessed to faults while in the iron teeth of the rack, which, as soon as he was released he boldly disavowed. The result was, of course, that he was condemned to death. The charges against him were those of heresy, persecution of the Papal Church, and deceiving of the people.

On May 23, 1498, a scaffold was erected on the public square known to the modern traveler as the *Piazza della Signoria.* It consisted of three gibbets, at the foot of which was heaped a mass of dry wood saturated with oil and sprinkled with brimstone. The same eager multitude which had been disappointed on the day of the ordeal was now assembled to witness the death-agonies of the reformer. Together with two of his most faithful friends, he was now brought forward and stationed beneath the gibbet. He now asked and obtained permission to partake of the eucharist. After having partaken himself, he administered the holy elements to his two friends, pronouncing the words, "My Lord freely died for my sins, why shall I not gladly offer up my life out of love to him? A bishop, at the pope's orders, now deposed the three monks from the priestly office. But when he pronounced the sentence, "Thus separate I thee from the Church triumphant," Savonarola nobly replied, "From the Church militant, not from the

Church triumphant; for that is beyond your power." As he was now handed over to the secular power many of the by-standers jeeringly cried out, "Now, monk, it is time to work a miracle." But Savonarola, who had counseled his companions to die in silence like Christ, who went forth like a lamb to the slaughter, made no reply, and was, doubtless, wholly absorbed in thoughts of God. As he was suspended to the gibbet, some of the multitude even took up stones and dashed them at that countenance over which they had once rejoiced to see the illumination of the Holy Spirit. But their eyes were now blinded. They saw nothing to respect in the patient resignation of this great man. The pile being now ignited, there soon remained on earth of the reformer monk only a heap of smouldering ashes; and even these, by the order of the remorseless pope, were carefully collected and strewn in the Arno.

But hate and injustice generally defeat themselves. The very spot where Savonarola perished has become a sort of Mecca, and is annually visited by thousands, both Catholics and Protestants, who shed the tear of sincere sorrow for the holy priest and the earnest reformer. The refreshing public fountain which now occupies the spot is a fit emblem of the salutary effects on their race of the lives of such men. From the scene of execution the genial painter Bartolomeo hastened to his studio and drew about the brow of his transfigured friend a golden halo, and this picture still hangs in Savonarola's cell, in San Marco. The moral sense of the Catholics was not so obscured but that his fate awakened in many bosoms the liveliest remorse. The Dominican order even attempted to procure his canonization. Luther declared that Christ had canonized him already. For ages it was the pious custom of his secret admirers every anniversary of his death to strew with garlands the hallowed spot of his martyrdom. Though defeated in the immediate object of his striving, the life of Savonarola was not in vain. He inspired Michæl Angelo with some of his noblest conceptions, his writings still speak to thousands of his countrymen, and his record on the page of universal history is a healthful and encouraging lesson for the world.

Art. VI.—ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

Every intelligent and careful observer of the condition of the Church at the present day must, we think, have distinctly marked two things: First, that among an unusually large number of ministers and laymen, of our own and other Churches, there is a yearning after a higher life, a restless desire for the "fullness of God;" and, secondly, that among others there is a tendency, at least, practically to lower the standard of Christian character and experience. The latter class is very large, far too large for the uniform growth and development of the Church.

There can possibly be no mistake or denial of the fact that the power of the Church is in its purity—the "beauty of holiness" displayed by it in the luminousness and luster of matured and perfected Christian virtues. When, therefore, its garments are soiled and spotted by the spirit, maxims, and doubtful practices of the world, this power is proportionally lost. The tendency of the Church to which we have referred, exhibits itself in a twofold form: first, in a "haste to be rich," which leads to doubtful enterprises and speculations, involving violations of the principles of truth, honesty, and justice; in conforming to the extravagant spirit of the age in dwellings, furniture, dress, and display; in mingling and participating in the vain and sinful amusements of the world, as dancing, card playing, novel reading, and attendance at the opera and theater. The second form is a result, a legitimate consequence of the first, and is seen in the neglect or indifference to divine things; a disrelish for the word of God and evangelical ministrations; non-attendance on the social spiritual services of the Church; laxity in morals and latitudinarianism in principle.

But while we cannot close our eyes to these things as characterizing multitudes who so unworthily bear the name of Christians, and while every true lover of Zion will mourn over them, the situation, so to speak, is not without encouragement and hope; for, perhaps, in no period within the last half century, at least, has the great truth of Christian holiness, or entire sanctification, in its doctrinal, experimental, and practical aspects, been more fully and freely discussed, more clearly

and distinctly enunciated, or more generally and favorably regarded.

While it may be said that Methodism has many things which serve to mark it as a distinct ecclesiastical organization, it is pre-eminently true that the doctrine which has grandly distinguished its theological literature, which has been clearly and powerfully proclaimed from its pulpits, and beautifully illustrated in the lives of many of its ministers and members, is that to which our attention is now directed.

From the time that Mr. Wesley received the witness of his adoption, and even before this happy period, his attention was called to this great truth. In the year 1725 he met with Bishop Taylor's "Rule and Exercises of Holy Living and Dying;" in 1726, with Kempis's "Christian's Pattern," and a year or two after this with Mr. Law's "Christian Perfection" and "Serious Call." In 1729 he began to study the Bible, where he saw "in a clearer light the indispensable necessity of having 'the mind which was in Christ,' and of walking as Christ also walked." As early as 1733 he preached on this great subject before the University in St. Mary's Church; and he declares that what he said in that sermon on "The Circumcision of the Heart," he scrupled not to call *perfection*, and that this is the view which he still had when he wrote his "Plain Account," without any material addition or diminution. While yet in Savannah, and still under the bondage of the law, he wrote hymns expressive of his firm belief in this truth, and his earnest desire for the experience of this blessing. The first witness that he ever heard speak of Christian perfection was Arvid Gradin, in Germany, whose experience entirely harmonized with what he had "learned from the oracles of God," and what he "had been praying for (with his company of friends) and expecting for several years."

It was only a short time subsequent to this that his heart was "strangely warmed" by the fire and cheered by the witness of the Holy Spirit, in Aldersgate-street, in London. This new life brought with it to his mind and heart a rush of new ideas, hopes, and joys. A new light made the pages of divine truth luminous to his inner eye, and he now saw clearly what he had before seen dimly—that it is the Christian's privilege to be made perfect in love in this life, to be "sanc-

tified wholly" before death, and to realize that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." He at once began more fully to proclaim the great evangel, to publish sermons and tracts with reference to it, and by correspondence and controversy to defend and maintain the truth. It became to him the *great central idea of Christianity*. From this standpoint he wrote his theology, and conceived the grand design of "spreading Christian holiness over all the land."

It is clearly evident, then, that this truth is so distinctly stated in our system of doctrines, so sweetly and constantly breathed in the hymnology of our Church, so frequently referred to in our pulpits, our love-feasts, and class-meetings, that the whole Christian world understand that the Methodist Episcopal Church, in all its branches, believes and maintains this doctrine. And not only so: every minister admitted to minister in our pulpits and at our altars is required satisfactorily and unqualifiedly to answer the following questions: "Are you going on to perfection?" "Do you expect to be made perfect in love in this life?" "Are you groaning after it?" We stand, therefore, *committed* to this truth before the world and before Heaven. We cannot, if we would, blink this question; we cannot overlook or ignore it without failing to comprehend the grandest characteristic of our doctrinal system, and the mission which God has given us, as a Church, to perform in this world. The question which we now come to consider is: "*What is Entire Sanctification as taught by the Methodist Church?*" It is well at this point we think, to say that in writing and speaking on this subject we are accustomed, as a Church, to use the words "entire sanctification," "holiness," "purity of heart," and "perfection," or "perfect love," as referring to the same state or experience. Although etymologically these words may bear different significations, yet theologically we regard all as referring to the same thing.

Beyond question it is important that we should, as far as possible, understand what the state or experience is to which these words refer, in order that we may see our need of it, that we may have some proper conception of what we desire, or are seeking after and expecting, and that when it is obtained we may knowingly and truthfully rejoice in its possession. It must not be overlooked either that the terminology employed

is not Wesleyan or Methodistic, but Biblical; words which "holy men of old wrote and spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The words holiness, perfection, perfect love, and sanctification, are not "the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." We have no controversy then with those who declaim against the use of these words; their controversy is with the Holy Ghost. The question before us is, What did Mr. Wesley, and what does the Methodist Church, understand the Holy Ghost as teaching by these words? In his "Plain Account of Christian Perfection," which is *the* text-book on this question, the following question and answer are found: "Quest. What is Christian Perfection? Ans. The loving God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength. This implies that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains in the soul; and that all the thoughts, words, and actions are governed by pure love." In this connection Mr. Wesley says, "These thoughts are the same that I have entertained for above twenty years," page 61. Mr. Fletcher, in his treatise on the same subject, says, "We call Christian Perfection the maturity of grace and holiness, which established, adult believers attain to under the Christian dispensation. In other words, Christian Perfection is a spiritual constellation made up of these gracious stars: perfect repentance, perfect faith, perfect humility, perfect meekness, perfect self-denial, perfect resignation, perfect hope, perfect charity for our visible enemies as well as for our earthly relations, and, above all, perfect love for our invisible God, through the explicit knowledge of our Mediator Jesus Christ." Mr. Watson defines this estate as follows: "Our complete deliverance from all spiritual pollution, all inward depravation of the heart as well as that which, expressing itself outwardly by the indulgence of the senses, is called "filthiness of the flesh."—*Inst.*, vol. ii, p. 450.

These definitions and descriptions of this state are regarded as sufficient, as to multiply they would only be a repetition of the same language and idea. But if the question were left right here it would remain very unsatisfactory to the mind of the earnest and honest inquirer after the truth. There are other points of the deepest interest connected with this subject, which are indeed vital to the right understanding and appreciation of it. That we may, if possible, bear some part in

throwing light upon questions which have been exceedingly perplexing to many honest and devout Christians in our own and other Churches, we now proceed to consider the points referred to above. We remark then, *Wesleyan Methodism distinctly teaches that this great work is begun in regeneration.* The teaching on this question is uniform and explicit, and meets with the approval of the orthodox Christian world. The idea is this, that when the sinner believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, he is not only justified, freely and fully forgiven and acquitted from all the penalties due to his transgressions, but that, at the same time, he is "born again," becomes a "new creature in Christ Jesus," and is "quickened" into a new life by the power of the Holy Ghost. In other words, the justified believer not only enjoys a change of his relation to God, the law, heaven, and eternity, but he also has a new life, and his nature is changed. Then, too, are implanted in his heart the germs of all the graces of the divine Spirit, which are to expand and grow in his future experience on condition of his fidelity to God. Hence Mr. Wesley says, in answer to the following question: When does inward sanctification begin? "In the moment a man is justified. Yet sin remains in him; yea, the seed of all sin till he is sanctified throughout. From that time [of his justification and regeneration] a believer gradually dies to sin and grows in grace."—*Plain Account*, p. 48. Again, in his sermons he says, "When we are born again then our sanctification, our inward and outward holiness, begins; and thenceforward we are gradually to 'grow up in Him who is our head.'"—*Works*, vol. i, p. 406. Again, "This [regeneration] is a part of sanctification, not the whole; it is the gate to it, the entrance into it."—*Ibid.* It is not necessary to dwell here, as on this point all are agreed.

But we now advance to the position which has been strenuously opposed by some who profess to be Methodistic in their theology; namely, that *while Methodism teaches that this work is begun in regeneration, it further declares that the work of entire sanctification is distinct from it.* It has been maintained by some writers on this doctrine that believers are wholly sanctified when justified and regenerated, and that all subsequent growth is in holiness: that there is no work of grace in the soul distinct from regenera-

tion, consequently the idea of a witness to such a work is a misconception, and a mistake on the part of those who have professed to receive it. In a word, that regeneration and sanctification are synonymous and synchronous. That such teachings are anti-Methodistic is clearly apparent, and at the same time we would say, with all deference and respect for many persons who honestly hold this view, that this is contrary, we believe, to the *experience* of the whole Christian world. In his sermon on Repentance in Believers, Mr. Wesley says, "From what has been said we may easily learn the mischievousness of the opinion that we are *wholly* sanctified when we are justified; that our hearts are then cleansed from all sin."—*Works*, vol. i, p. 124. Again, "We allow that at the very moment of justification we are *born again;* in that instant we experience that inward change from 'darkness into marvelous light;' from the image of the brute and the devil into the image of God; from the earthly, sensual, devilish mind, to the mind which was in Christ Jesus. But are we then *entirely* changed? Are we *wholly* transformed into the image of Him who created us? Far from it; we still retain a depth of sin, and it is the consciousness of this which constrains us to groan for a full deliverance to Him who is mighty to save." —*Ibid.* His whole sermon on "Sin in Believers," is proof of the same position. With equal clearness and distinctness Mr. Watson, in his Institutes, says, "That a distinction exists between a regenerate state and a state of entire and perfect holiness will be generally allowed. Regeneration, we have seen, is concomitant with justification; but the apostles, in addressing the body of believers in the Churches, to whom they wrote their epistles, set before them, both in the prayers they offer in their behalf and in the exhortations they administer, a still higher degree of deliverance from sin, as well as a higher growth in Christian virtues."—Vol. ii, p. 450. In his Plain Account, Mr. Wesley says, "There is, indeed, an instantaneous as well as a gradual work of God in his children; but we do not know a *single instance in any place* of a person receiving, in one and the same moment, remission of sins, the abiding witness of the Spirit, and a new, clean heart."—Page 34. Not only did Mr. Wesley teach that persons are not sanctified wholly when justified, but also, he says, "To suppose the con-

trary,"—that is that men *are* sanctified when justified—"is not, as some may think, an innocent and harmless mistake. No; it does immense harm. It entirely blocks up the way to any further change, for it is manifest, "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." If, therefore, we think we are quite made whole already there is no room to seek any further healing. On this supposition, it is absurd to expect a further deliverance from sin, whether gradual or instantaneous.—*Works*, vol. i, p. 124. Strange that some Methodists, and some Methodist preachers, have declared that Mr. Wesley taught such an absurd thing. The regenerated soul, then, is also sanctified, but not *wholly*. The work is begun, but its beginnings are feeble and coexistent with the indwelling and remains of sin in the soul. Yet again it teaches *that from the moment of regeneration there is in the faithful Christian a gradual growth toward entire sanctification* or *Christian perfection*. To deny this gradual work would be to deny not only the plain teachings of the word of God and the corresponding teachings of Methodism, but also the conscious experience of every faithful believer. The great, the *only* question here between us and other Christians is, Is this work only gradual? Is it never instantaneous excepting at the hour of death? Must we be ever gradually moving toward this mark, or may we suddenly and instantaneously reach it by faith? To the latter, Methodism, as we shall see, answers affirmatively, while the creeds and confessions of other Churches reply in the negative. It is admitted in our doctrinal teachings that persons *may* gradually attain to this state; that most Christians *do* in this way, and only a short period before death, receive it; but, at the same time, that it is possible *now*, at the present time, instantaneously to believe and enter into this rest. Mr. Wesley says on this point, "From that time," the moment a man is justified, "he gradually dies to sin and grows in grace."—*Plain Account*, p. 49. "The one who is sanctified has experienced previous thereto a gradual mortification of sin."—*Ibid.*, p. 79. Again, in his Sermons, he says, "When we are born again, then our sanctification begins; thenceforward we gradually do grow up in Him who is our living head." To illustrate this, he says, "A child is born of a woman in a moment; afterward he gradually and slowly grows till he attains to the

stature of a man. In like manner a child is born of God in a short time, if not in a moment, but it is by slow degrees that he afterward grows up to 'the measure of the full stature of Christ.' The same relation, therefore, which is between our natural birth and our growth there is also between our new birth and our sanctification."—*Works*, vol. i, p. 406. In like manner, Mr. Fletcher says, "To deny that imperfect believers may and do gradually grow in grace, and, of course, that the remains of their sins may and do gradually decay, is as absurd as to deny that God waters the earth by daily dews as well as by thunder showers." —Page 47. Again, Mr. Wesley admits, "1. That the generality of believers whom we have hitherto known were not so sanctified till near death; 2. That few of those to whom St. Paul wrote his epistles were so at that time; nor 3. He himself, at the time of writing his former epistles; "yet," he adds, "all this does not prove that we may not be so [sanctified] to-day."—*Plain Account*, p. 49. Nothing, then, can be clearer or more distinct as to a gradual work than Mr. Wesley's teaching; and this teaching, so eminently scriptural, meets with a cordial response from the heart of every true Christian. But, at the same time, Mr. Wesley never loses sight of the great fact that *there is a period when this work of sanctification becomes complete and entire; and that, although in most instances the work is gradual, it may be in all cases instantaneous.*

It is well to bear in mind that it is admitted on all hands, by Calvinists as well as Wesleyans, that this work must be completed before we are fully prepared for heaven or can be admitted into its enjoyment. But the Calvinist says that it is not, nor can it be, completed until death; that just before the soul leaves the body, the work is "cut short in righteousness," and the believer taken to the abodes of infinite holiness and joy. Two things are thus admitted: First, That this work must be done before the soul has a "meetness" for heaven; and, Second, That in all cases this is done *suddenly* and *instantaneously*. The question may well be asked of those who hold this theory, What agencies or influences are at work *in articulo mortis* which have not been available to the believer during every moment of his previous religious history? Is the blood of Christ more available now? Is the Holy Spirit nearer or more powerful now? Is the command any more

urgent to be holy, or the promises any greater or more precious? What, then, is it in the hour of dying, which produces this wonderful transformation? Yet further; how long before death may this work be realized and enjoyed? a moment, an hour, a day? But if a moment, an hour, a day, why not a week, a month, a year, years before? If this work of justification is by the blood of Christ, then its power to cleanse is just as great and efficacious now as at any conceivable period in the future. If the entire sanctification of the believer is by the inworking of the Holy Ghost, then he is just as great and gracious now as he ever can or will be. What, then, is that agent which is present and so potent under the circumstance or in the article of death, that this work is then wrought and not before? Is it *death* itself? But supposing that we personify death, as we frequently do, what power has *he* to do the work for the Christian? "And what do we know of death," as Butler says in his Analogy, "but only some of its effects, such as the dissolution of the flesh, skin, and bones?" But if it is death that does this work, then it is not the blood of Christ, then it is not the Holy Spirit, then death must have more power than either. We scarcely need say here that death is a purely physical change. Its whole effects, so far as we know, are upon the body. It unfits the body for the residence and operations of the soul; and that soul, just as it leaves the body, enters the eternal world. It may be, as Butler further says, "For aught we know of our present life and of death, death may immediately, in the natural course of things, put us into a higher and more enlarged state of life, as our birth does—a state in which our capacities and sphere of action may be much greater than at present."* But while this admission will readily be made it is evident, both from analogy and revelation, that death produces no *moral change* in the soul; in fact all the evidence would seem to be to the contrary. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." It is, indeed, morally certain that we enter eternity, so far as our spiritual or moral state is concerned, precisely in the same condition as we leave the body. One of two things,

* Analogy, p. 127.

then, must be true: either we must be wholly sanctified *before* we leave the body, or *after* we have left the body. If it is done before the soul leaves the body it is done before death actually takes place, say a moment, an hour, a day. But if so, then the conclusions reached before are irresistible—that it may be a week, a month, a year, or even years before. But if *after*, then a purgatory is necessary. Mr. Fletcher, in his treatise, presents this point clearly and unanswerably. "Nobody," he says, "is so apt to laugh at the instantaneous destruction of sin as the Calvinists; and yet their doctrine of purgatory is built upon it; for if you credit them, all dying believers have a nature which is morally corrupted, and a heart which is yet 'desperately wicked.' These believers, still full of indwelling sin, instantaneously breathe out their last, and without any peculiar act of faith, without any peculiar outpouring of the sanctifying Spirit, corruption is instantaneously gone. The indwelling man of sin has passed through the Genevan purgatory; he is entirely consumed; and, behold! the souls which would not hear of the instantaneous act of sanctifying faith which receives the indwelling Spirit of holiness—the souls which pleaded hard for the continuance of indwelling sin—are now completely sinless, and in the twinkling of an eye they appear in the third heavens among the spirits of just Christians made perfect in love!"—Pp. 46, 47, small edition.

But it may be said that the instrument in this work is faith, and that most Christians do not comprehend their duty and privilege until at, or near, the close of their earthly career. This is doubtless true; but it by no means overthrows the doctrine taught by Methodism, that *whenever* this faith is exercised, this work will be wrought. If this great blessing is received by faith, then it must be while the soul is yet in a probationary state; and if at one period of probation, it may be equally well at another. But the word of God nowhere teaches that this work cannot be performed until death. On the other hand it presents it before us as a present work, an actual living state and experience. All the commands of God to be "holy," "perfect," to "love him with all the heart," are present. So all the promises bearing on this subject are present. The prayers offered by Christ and his apostles for the early Church look to the present life for their answer.

"Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Paul bowed his knees and prayed that the members of the Ephesian Church might be "filled with all the fullness of God." We might also quote 1 Thess. v, 23; Heb. xiii, 20, 21; 1 Peter v, 10; 1 John iv, 17, 18.

It follows, then, with all the force of an irresistible conclusion, that if the blood of Christ has power now to cleanse from all sin—if the Holy Spirit now and at every moment possesses the power to sanctify the believer—if the promises of the inspired word are not only "all yea, and amen in Christ Jesus," but are now made and refer to the present moment—then, when the soul trusts in that blood, asks in faith that Spirit, appropriates by faith the exceeding great and precious promises, the work will be—it *is*—done. The question does not turn upon what we are, the disabilities under which we labor, the weaknesses and sins under which we groan, but on what the blood of Christ and the Holy Spirit can do for us and within us. If that blood ever has cleansed a human soul from all unrighteousness it can do it now. If the Holy Spirit has ever sanctified one believer wholly he can do it now.

But it is a question of great importance just at this point, What is *sin*? Much of the confusion, strange to say, which has arisen in arguing this question, has been for the want of a clear definition and understanding of this word. The general idea of sin is the scriptural meaning given of it, "The transgression of the law." With more of definiteness it has been understood to be the willful transgression of a known law. This has reference to man's voluntary action. But the word also is understood to refer to "original or birth sin," which is "the corruption of the nature of every man, whereby he is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined only to evil, and that continually."

There is yet another definition attached to this word by Calvinistic divines, and substantially agreed to by Mr. Wesley, which is by no means so commonly considered or understood; namely, "A want of conformity to the (perfect) law of God." Now, this latter definition goes still further than either of the preceding, and includes not only voluntary evil actions, and a corrupt and depraved nature, but also all the involuntary imperfections, infirmities, and frailties of our present state,

which are, indeed, contrary to the perfect law of God, but which do not bring condemnation on the conscience in view of Christ's atoning blood. Now when the Wesleyan speaks of being "made free from sin," or of being "cleansed from all sin," he not only means that all his actual transgressions have been forgiven, but also that "the carnal mind," the corrupt and depraved heart, has been changed, transformed, cleansed, and wholly sanctified. But he never understands himself, or means that others should understand him, as claiming to be free from these frailties and disabilities inseparable from his present state of being. But the Calvinist understands him to profess that he is made free from all these involuntary effects of his naturally weak and imperfect state. Against this idea his mind naturally revolts; and, if we mistake not, this is the case with many who do not understand the Wesleyan theory on this subject, although professedly Methodists. It must never be lost sight of that it is not the perfection or holiness of angels, or of the first Adam in his original state, that we speak of. "That is a perfection measured by the perfect law, which, in its obligations, contemplates all creatures as having sustained no injury by moral lapse, and admits, therefore, no excuse from infirmities and mistakes of judgment; nor of any degree of obedience below that which beings created naturally perfect were capable of rendering."* "These mistakes, defects, and infirmities may be quite consistent with the entire sanctification of the soul, and the moral maturity of a being still naturally infirm and imperfect."† In like manner Mr. Wesley frequently speaks on this point; so frequently that every one at all familiar with his writings will readily refer to his explanations. One quotation may suffice, as it is clear and explicit: "I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, [of the perfect law,] which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. Therefore *sinless perfection* is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself."‡

This view of the case effectually disposes of the objection often made, "If you are cleansed from all sin what need have you to pray, 'Forgive us our trespasses;' what need have you

* Watson's Institutes, vol. 2, p. 456. † Ibid. ‡ Plain Account, p. 67–116.

any more of the atoning blood?" To this Mr. Wesley replies, "Even these souls [which are filled with love] dwell in a shattered body, and are so pressed down thereby that they cannot always exert themselves as they would, by thinking, speaking, and acting precisely right. For want of better bodily organs, they must, at times, think, speak, or act wrongly; not, indeed, through a defect of love, but through a defect of knowledge. Yet as, even in this case, there is not a full conformity to the perfect law, so the most perfect do on this very account need the blood of atonement, and may, properly, for themselves as well as for their brethren, say, 'Forgive us our trespasses.'" No class of persons have ever sung more earnestly, and with a greater depth of feeling than those who have been made perfect in love, or wholly sanctified,

> "*Every moment*, Lord, I *need*
> The merit of thy death."

Another objection to this doctrine may be considered here. It is as follows: "If one is wholly sanctified, and all the graces of the Spirit are perfect, what room is there for further growth and development?" To this it is answered at once, "These graces of the Spirit are not perfect in *degree*, but only in their nature or character; while everything contrary to them is removed from the soul, so that their growth and development may be unchecked and unhindered." To this it may be replied, "But you admit that all these graces are implanted in the regenerated soul, and are there perfect in kind; what, then, is the difference between the two states?" To this we reply, They exist in the soul of the sanctified believer under vastly more favorable circumstances than in the merely regenerated spirit. The remains of sin in the regenerate person hinder their growth and mar their perfectness. On the other hand, when the soul is wholly sanctified—"made perfect in love"—these hinderances to their growth are removed, and they grow and develop with a rapidity unknown before. As an illustration of this we may take the following: Here is a beautiful garden plot. The soil is rich; the plants, shrubs, and flowers are all of a rare and costly kind, and have been carefully planted or set out in the carefully prepared soil. But soon it is perceived that the seedlings of noxious weeds which had been

concealed in the soil, are germinating and growing rapidly; their roots are entwined in the roots of the plants, and their subsequent growth overshadows plant and flower, so that they cannot derive the full benefit of soil or sunshine, rain or dew. Yet these plants may and do grow under all these disabilities, and a beautiful flower will bloom here and a rare plant will lift up its head there. Now suppose that all these weeds are carefully removed, so that no unfavorable influence is exerted on the one hand, and the full benefit of air and shower, sunshine and rain and dew, are realized, what a difference there will be in the rapidity of growth and the beauty and maturity of plants and flowers! So with the soul made free from the remains of sin, purified from its defilements and stains. Faith now increases, unchecked by unbelief. Love now expands, unlimited by selfishness or hate, or love of the world. Humility now develops, unmarred by pride. "Patience has its perfect work," unmingled with murmuring or repining. Meekness, like the lily of the valley, exhales its fragrance unsmothered by anger or ill-will, envy or jealousy. Peace holds her gentle sway over the soul undisturbed by stormy passions, unagitated by inward alarms, and unconsumed by the gnawing tooth of care. Storms may arise and tempests may rage against such a soul *without*, but within there is a settled calm "which passeth all understanding." Now, then, we see that instead of there being *no* growth in the sanctified believer, there is a rapid, healthy, and unintermitting growth. For some of the graces, whose exercise belongs to this present world, this is continued till life's last, lingering moment; for others, this growth is continued *forever and ever.*

Another point connected with this subject, often doubted, and not unfrequently assailed, is, *That to this work, when performed, the Holy Spirit bears a clear and direct witness.* This has been doubted, and even denied, by many; and yet it is scarcely necessary to say that it is the Wesleyan teaching on this point. Quotations sustaining this position might be multiplied, but one clear and definite utterance will be sufficient. Mr. Wesley says, "None ought to believe that the work is done till there is added the testimony of the Spirit, witnessing his entire sanctification *as clearly as his justification.**

* Plain Account, p. 79.

Let us examine this point, then, a little more fully. If this work is of such great importance as the whole word of God and our Wesleyan theology declare it to be, is it not important that we should not only seek to have it performed, but also that we should know when it is done? There can be no question whatever as to the *possibility* of the Spirit bearing witness to this work when it is done. In other words, no one will doubt that the same divine agent who is the "Spirit of adoption" to the justified believer, may be the Spirit which witnesses to the holiness of the wholly sanctified believer. But it is not only possible that the Spirit of God can do this, it is also highly *probable* that he will do it. If the struggling child of God has been washed in the fountain of the Redeemer's blood—if the Holy Spirit has sanctified the believer wholly—will he not witness to his own work? Will he not, with the performance of the work, give the seal that it is done? Or must it be with the sanctified believer as the Calvinist regards it must be with the justified, that he must go all his life long doubting and fearing whether this work is done or not? If the Christian may be entirely sanctified, if he may enjoy "perfect love," will he not *know* that this blessed work has been wrought, and that this rich experience is his?

But we advance yet another step and say, The Spirit *does* give this witness to the sanctified soul. Men and women of the highest intelligence, of the greatest moral worth, and of the most undoubted piety, have declared that they have received and enjoyed this witness for years as clearly as they ever enjoyed the witness of their justification. Fletcher, Adam Clarke, Bramwell, Mrs. Fletcher, Lady Maxwell, Lady Fitzgerald, Hester Ann Rogers, Carvosso, and a host of other names have borne their concurrent and joyful testimony to this in life and in death. Can we doubt their testimony? Did not their saintly lives confirm the evidence they bore? And if *one* has ever had this experience, so may another, so may *all* who will use the same means. But the question is asked here, "Is it not possible to be deceived?" Certainly, and doubtless many have been; but it is not necessary that they should be. On this point Mr. Wesley speaks with his usual explicitness: "When may a person judge him-

self to have attained this? *Ans.* When after having been fully convinced of inbred sin by a far deeper and clearer conviction than he experienced before justification, and after having experienced a gradual mortification of it, he experiences a total death to sin, and an entire renewal in the love and image of God, so as to rejoice evermore, to pray without ceasing, and in everything to give thanks."—*Plain Account*, p. 78. And in answer to another question in this connection, he says, "I know no instance of a person attending to them all, [that is, the marks of this work,] and yet deceived in this matter, I believe there can be none in the world."—*Ibid.*, p. 79.

Where this work is truly performed there will be genuine humility. Holiness and humility are inseparably and eternally connected together. It is so in all the grades of Christian holiness on earth; it is so in all the degrees of holiness in heaven. The nearer the soul comes to God, the more completely it is humbled, subdued, and overpowered. It was when Job heard the voice of the Lord out of the whirlwind that he exclaimed, "I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." When the "still small voice" of God spake to the exiled prophet in his cave, he wrapped his blushing face in his mantle, and his whole being bowed before the divine presence and power. It was when the evangelical prophet Isaiah saw the glory of the Lord, and heard the six-winged seraphim crying one to another, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts," that he cried out, "Woe is me, for I am undone." It was after Paul had been caught up into the third heavens that he said of himself that he was "the least of all saints." And it was the beloved disciple, whose head had leaned on the bosom of Jesus, and whose eyes had beheld his glory in apocalyptic vision, whose meek, child-like spirit has been the admiration of the ages. Thus it is with every saint of God on earth, and it is so with every glorified spirit in heaven. The higher the soul rises in holiness, the deeper it sinks in humility and self-abasement. So sings Montgomery.

"The bird that soars on highest wing,
Builds on the ground her lowly nest:
And she that doth most sweetly sing,
Sings in the shade when all things rest:
In lark and nightingale we see
What honor hath humility.

The saint that wears heaven's brightest crown,
In lowliest adoration bends;
The weight of glory bows him down
The most, when most his soul ascends:
Nearest the throne itself must be
The footstool of humility."

As we close this article we repeat, this doctrine is the grand distinguishing peculiarity of Methodistic theology. Other denominations, as such, perhaps from a failure to comprehend its significance, have treated it with indifference, some even with scorn and contempt; but Methodism has gloried in it. Indeed, properly considered, it is our highest glory. Our hymnology is thoroughly baptized with it. Our whole theological literature has been written from this standpoint. The heroes and heroines of our Church have been its consistent and undoubted witnesses. In his "Introduction to Systematic Theology," Dr. Warren says, "In respect to its inmost spirit and essence, it (Methodism) is a viewing of Christianity from the standpoint of Christian perfection, or perfect love." In his review of this work, Dr. M'Clintock says, "The formal principle of Methodism is Christian perfection, or perfect love."

Here, then, is the platform upon which we, as Methodists, stand. To us this great truth, in the providence of God, seems to have been specially intrusted. May we be faithful to our trust! The whole Church should be taught to pray for it, and to expect to enjoy it; and "every step we take toward it," in the words of Leighton, "is worth more to us than crowns and scepters. Toward this state of grace every faithful Christian is constantly advancing with more or less rapidity; and the more rapid the growth in grace, the nearer the soul comes to God, the sooner will this work be accomplished. For it is not the one who is living afar from God who feels the need of this or seeks it; but he who, in a justified state lives nearest to God, will feel most deeply the need of this great salvation, and strive and groan after it the more earnestly. So Mr. Wesley taught.* So the experience of the Church has been in the past; and so it will continue to be. It is while we "walk in the light as He is in the light," that "we have fellowship one

* Plain Account, pp. 49, 71.

with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

This great blessing is what the whole of the ministry and membership of our Church need. This only can save us from the inrushing tide of worldliness, ritualism, and formality. This is the grand living demonstration of the truth, the beauty, and the glory of Christianity, and the only effectual barrier against infidelity in all its grades and forms. Its experience would speedily usher in the glories of the millennium, and fill the world with songs and shouts of triumph and joy. And this will yet be realized. The voice of God in his word and in his providence is calling now to the Church as it never has called before, "Awake! awake! put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem." May we hear that voice, gird ourselves with that strength, and array ourselves in those beautiful garments!

I conclude with the stirring words of Dr. M'Clintock, at the first great centenary meeting in St. Paul's Church, New York, which at the time of their utterance seemed like an inspiration, and which now should startle the whole Church like a trumpet-blast. Speaking of *the* distinctive features of Methodism he said, "It may be called fanaticism, but, dear friends, that is our mission. If we keep to that the next century is ours; if we keep to that the triumphs of the next century shall throw those that are past far into the shade. Our work is a moral work; that is to say, the work of making men holy. Our preaching is to that, our Church agencies are for that. There is our mission, there is our glory, there is our power, and there shall be the ground of our triumph. God keep us true!"

Art. VII.—ESTHETICS IN COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

The attention of the leading thinkers of our country is at the present time drawn in an unusual degree to the reforming or the remodeling of the higher departments of our educational system. More changes will probably be introduced into this system during the next twenty-five years than within a century

thereafter. The formation or transition period in the development of any element of culture or civilization necessarily determines its future. The present is therefore a most critical time in the history of American education.

In order to approach our subject intelligently it will be necessary, first, to throw a hasty glance at the proper method for the classification or gradation of our schools, and then to take a general survey of the subjects proper for collegiate study. We must fix before our minds a purely ideal system of education; a system organized as though we had a *tabula rasa*, with opportunity and means to arrange everything exactly as this system may require. Next, we must be practical, and see what steps can be taken now to prepare the way for the final introduction of this ideal system in the place of the one at present in vogue, and which has been almost entirely the child of circumstances; or for the incorporation of such features of this ideal system as may be feasible in the different existing institutions of learning in the country.

In speaking of the classification or gradation of schools, let us begin by clearly defining our terms. Let us not speak of "university reform" when we mean "college reform," unless we intend, in a rigid discussion, to adopt a popular use of words, and to consider *college* and *university* as synonyms. On the continent of Europe the term university means a post-graduate or a post-collegiate institution. In England the term university, as applied to Oxford or Cambridge, means but little more than a collection of many colleges of nearly equal grade, though the University of London is slowly making its way to the ground occupied by the universities on the continent. In America we practically use the words college and university as convertible terms. Passing by that large number of institutions in the West which have charters covering all possible fields of instruction, but which are in reality but mere academies, and speaking of our oldest and best institutions of learning, we mean by a college or a university a school of collegiate grade in which the college is the only, or else by far the dominant, feature, but which has begun, or is looking with longing eyes to the time when it may begin, to append technical or professional schools to the parent and dominant school, the college. Educators in Germany, England, and

America would have, therefore, to convert their terms before they could understand each other with reference to university reform.

There seems but one way to get out of this confusion of terms. We must change the organization of our educational system. Our schools should be divided into four grades. These should commence with the child learning his alphabet, and terminate with the highest professional instruction the age can give. The lines of demarkation between the grades should be so drawn as to give natural divisions and gradations in the matter and method of instruction for those designing to finish an entire curriculum, and at the same time furnish convenient stopping places for those who cannot go on to the higher grades. These four grades we will term *the primary*, *the academic*, *the collegiate*, and *the university*. The methods of instruction to be adopted, the management of the scholars, and the entire organization and individual corporate life of these four grades of schools are so different and distinct, that they cannot be united without doing great injury to each of any two grades that may be brought together in the same school.

Neither of the four grades will, therefore, assume the name nor do the work of any of the others. The primary and academic students are equally injured by joining a primary "A B C" department to an academy. A preparatory department is no more of a nuisance to a college than it is an injury to the preparatory students, who ought to be in an academy till they are ready to enter the college classes. The severe and just censures made by eastern institutions upon the schools of the West, that they are colleges in name but often are merely mediocre academies in fact, are met by the equally just and severe censures by European educators upon all of our American universities, which are so often but mediocre colleges. Unless this incongruity can be removed, educators in America will come to accept the opinion so universally held in Europe, that the high education of our country must always be inferior to that of the old world.

It would be as difficult to get the University of Berlin, Paris, Munich, or Naples to make a gymnasium its chief feature, or to connect a gymnasium with it in any manner whatever, as it

would be to get Yale or Amherst College, or Harvard, Brown, or the Wesleyan University, to make an academy its chief feature, or to add an academy to the college on any condition whatever. The work, regimen, and individuality of an academy are recognized to be distinct from those of a college. Equally distinct are those of a college and a university.

An examination of the catalogues of the colleges of the country shows that wherever there is a professor of unusual age, character, influence, or pertinacity, his branch is developed to a disproportionate predominance over the other departments, and beyond the true scope of a college. In nearly all colleges important branches of a liberal education are greatly neglected or are omitted entirely.

But the greatest evil of our system, or rather of our lack of intelligent system, is that every one of the two hundred and more colleges in America are trying, and some have already succeeded, in adding university departments. There are thus tacked to the different colleges of America enough fragments of a university to form, if united and organized on a judicious plan, at least one good university, that would compete honorably with any in the old world. It needs but a glance at the future to see, that within the coming quarter of a century many millions of dollars will be spent in aggravating this evil, in thus attaching to colleges fragments of a university. Much more will thus be spent than would be required to found a university equal in scope to that in Berlin, with its two hundred professors, representing every department of human learning; and, after all, we will have but a multitude of scattered fragments of a university, some departments of instruction being repeated twenty times, and others not being represented at all. After all, our young men will have to go abroad for that instruction which, under a better system, and without the outlay of a dollar more, might be given them in our own land. After all, America will occupy but a provincial relation to the capitals of learning in the old world. The unbounded resources of our country, and the great enterprise and generosity of our people, will enable us to carry on this guerrilla warfare for many years, and at the outlay of many millions of dollars. Still our pertinacity and elastic adaptability to newly-

felt wants are guarantees also that we will eventually see the necessity of having post-graduate universities, organized as separately from the colleges as the colleges are from the academies. But it is painful to think of the time that will be lost and the money that will be wasted in experiments which every intelligent observer of educational movements must see beforehand will be abortive.

But it will be necessary to prolong the portico to our house a little more before entering into the building itself.

"Possession makes nine points in law." In any land or in any age, those studies that occupy the ground in a system of education have a great advantage over new claimants for admission. Their fruits are tangible, are before the eyes of all. The fact that a different course, in a land five thousand miles away, or two thousand years ago, also produced great, in some respects superior, results is very intangible. It may or it may not be so. And if the new comer has never been tested, whatever may be the fruit it might produce it will be rejected. In education, as in medicine, we dislike experiment. The difficulties attending a change also often cause it to be rejected even when it is really desired.

It would be imprudent, indeed, to make any change without the greatest caution. Antiquity, or distance, is not of itself any proof of excellence. The ancient distaff is not better than the modern spinning jenny or the sewing machine. The camels of the Orient, though used by the patriarch Abraham, or the merchants of Palmyra, are not better than the locomotive. So methods of instruction, followed by the priests of ancient Egypt, in classical Greece, or to-day in vogue in England, France, or Germany, are not, for their antiquity or geographical distance, better than those existing in America.

On the other hand, not every steam-plow or cigar-shaped steamer is to be adopted because it is new or novel: neither should every fanciful system of education that is proposed. In material and spiritual matters alike, antiquity or newness, distance or nearness, are of themselves no criterion whatever as to whether anything is good or bad. But everything, old or new, native or foreign, must be judged by its own intrinsic merits. If theoretical conclusions can be fortified by experience in past history or in other lands, it will aid as much in

forming intelligent opinions. Innovations must, however, be sometimes introduced, for which past history gives us no experience. It is, indeed, only by these that any progress has ever been made. Resisting all change, the tribes of Arabia have moved around in the monotonous, eddying circles of patriarchal life, while their neighbors, the nations of southern and western Europe, have launched out and been borne along on the stream of civilization.

We will now throw a hasty glance at the history of collegiate education in America, and the changes it has undergone. The colleges established in New England during colonial times have stamped the character of all American colleges. They were modeled, essentially, after the type of the English colleges of that day. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were originally organized on the same plan as those of continental Europe. All European universities had their college or charity halls for giving lodging and board to poor students. Endowments were afterward left to support tutors, also, for these charity students. The Reformation, and other political and social upheavals, overthrew the universities in England, except in their names and in some of the forms of their organization. The halls or colleges survived these upheavals, and their endowments increased in number and value. And thus these halls or colleges, which were laid aside altogether on the continent two centuries ago, in England quite supplanted the original university system. On the continent gymnasiums were established to feed the universities, and primary schools to feed the gymnasiums, thus giving a system of graded schools, from the most elementary to the university course—called with us the post-graduate course. At the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, when our American colleges were established upon the then-existing model of the colleges which are clustered in Oxford and Cambridge, those colleges hardly equaled our academies or seminaries of to-day in the extent or rigor of their courses of study. The English colleges have never approximated the universities on the continent; and they still retain essentially their medieval course of study and organization, except that they are attended now by the nobility, instead of by charity students.

Our early American colleges were thus modeled after those of England, and that at a time in their history when they were a hundred and fifty years behind those of continental Europe, both in the scope and character of the instruction given. At that period the renaissance was at its height. All native or modern literature, art, or philosophy was tabooed as vulgar and barbarous. Everything that came from Greece or Rome was good: everything that did not was bad. A universal classicism pervaded every department of civilization. St. Paul's Cathedral was a vast Roman temple. Milton's Paradise Lost has the same classical stamp. In the colleges, the whole curriculum of studies consisted of Latin, Greek, Mathematics, a smattering of scholastic philosophy and barbarous logic, and enough Hebrew to enable the student of theology to tell the meaning of Golgotha. These studies became the basis of our American academies and colleges, and have remained so till this day.

Since that time Linnæus has created the science of botany; Werner, that of geology; Black and others, that of chemistry; Blackstone, that of civil law; Vattel, that of international law; Mosheim, that of Church history; Winckelmann, that of classical archæology; Boeck, that of classical philology; Grimm, the philology of the Teutonic languages; Diez, that of the romance languages; Craik and Marsh, that of the English language; Bopp, that of comparative language; Piper, that of Christian archæology; Ritter, that of comparative geography; Schnaser and Kugler, that of art-history; Vischer, that of esthetics.

With this prolific growth of studies, that bear directly upon our immediate daily life, that tend to our highest culture for the present, and to the most safe moulding of our civilization in the future; in what degree might we be justified in looking for a corresponding modification of our system of instruction, especially in a land like America, where every college stands upon its own basis, absolutely free from that centralization of power, official dependency, and government control, that so hamper the gymnasiums and universities of Europe? In no country in the world has there been a more conservative adherence to methods of study originally adopted, than in this free America. In the study even of the classical languages

we generally follow a method and use a class of grammars and text-books which were laid aside in Germany as antiquated a generation ago. Still, in spite of this strong conservative spirit—when not carried to excess, one of the greatest safeguards of a free people—important changes have been introduced into many of our academies and colleges. With us they have begun, like all changes in republics, in the lower strata, and have worked upward, instead of working from above downward, as in Europe. The studies of intellectual and moral science, history, political economy, international, constitutional, and municipal law, and of the natural sciences in general, are quite universally pursued, though in a very rudimentary manner. The result is, that, while the gymnasiums of Germany produce scholars beyond comparison more rigidly trained, our American colleges give a more general culture, and make the more mature and independent thinkers.

In Germany, the representative land of European education, as with us, many new studies are clamoring for admittance to the gymnasiums and colleges. Most of them will continue clamoring until they are admitted, notwithstanding that in both lands the curriculums are already overcrowded. This will be accomplished by the same method that attended the contest of the natural sciences for admittance, by first making the new studies elective, and then by making additional courses of study. Many studies now in the collegiate course will be thrown back into the preparatory or academic course; others will be thrown forward to their true place in the university. There will be thus preserved that indispensable feature to a good collegiate system of study, a general uniformity in the method and scope of instruction; and at the same time a certain freedom will be allowed to the taste and choice of the individual student, even before he enters upon his professional studies at the university.

For a long time a dual warfare was carried on between the languages and mathematics for supremacy in education. The natural sciences have entered the arena, and the combat has become a triangular one. But a new rival is pressing its way forward, and will draw upon itself the swords of all three of the present valiant warriors.

We will first look at the subject from a purely philosophical standpoint. Man is a *twofold being.* He is *body and spirit.** Each of these parts of his double nature is governed by its own laws, is capable of its own peculiar development, and has its own range of activity. Leaving aside, then, the physical part of man, and passing by the classification of the faculties of the spirit, all of which are called into activity in different degrees in every study, we may consider the ranges of spiritual activity from three standpoints; or they may be measured, so to speak, like a cube by its three co-ordinates, x, y, and z, that is, with reference to their subject-matter, their method, or their quality.

The three great classes of subject-matter are *theology*, or a knowledge of deity; *anthropology*, or a knowledge of humanity; and *cosmology*, or a knowledge of the material universe.

The three great methods are the *theoretical*, the *historical*, and the *practical.*

The third plan of classification considers the three great qualities that pervade every being, created or uncreated, in the universe—the *good*, the *true*, and the *beautiful.*

Each of these three grand plans of classification is exhaustive. Either must be considered with reference to the other two. And in each the parts so overlap and intertwine, that an accurate and absolute drawing of dividing lines is impossible. The last one is the most available and the most natural as a basis for classifying the studies in a system of education.

In our present system the first two elements, the good and the true, are strongly though not symmetrically represented. The *good* is developed in the instruction in moral science that is given in all of our academies and colleges, in the theological seminaries, by the religious press, by the pulpit, the Sabbath-school, and other ecclesiastical institutions.

The *true*, meaning thereby, of course, the foundation of all knowledge, or of science taken in its broadest sense, is brought forward in the instruction in the sciences that is given in our schools, primary, academic, collegiate, and technical or pro-

* The common expression that man has a threefold nature—moral, physical, and intellectual—is based upon too crude an examination of the attributes of humanity to require a lengthy criticism.

fessional; in the cabinets and museums of our schools and cities; in the scientific journals and books of the day; and in the scientific associations that exist in many of our leading cities.

But what provision is made in our existing system of education in America to open the soul to that third world within and without us—to the world of beauty? What opportunity do our colleges afford to enable their students to develop those noble aspirations for the beautiful, innate in every human breast; to give form to plans or projections of works of art that may dimly float in their minds; to enable them to pass an intelligent criticism upon a work of art or, indeed, to have one for themselves, in the thousands of cases where they will be called upon to decide upon works of art, whether they are qualified to do so or not? In most of our colleges none at all; in a few, the principles of criticism are slightly taught; in fewer still is practical instruction given; and in none whatever have the history of the fine arts and their relation to the general history of civilization been taught. This is a radical fault, not only in our collegiate but in our primary and academic schools, that the esthetic element is so completely ignored in instruction.

Having thus established that in an ideal system of education the moral, the scientific, and the esthetic should have equal prominence, we will proceed to consider briefly the objects of esthetic culture, and how far *they can be accomplished in the college course of study.*

One of the most important objects to be secured is the development of native artists. America, this giant among nations, with a territory larger and richer than that of all Europe; with a population boasting loudly their superiority in genius and enterprise over the inhabitants of any other land; America, whose common schools are the best in the world; which publishes more newspapers, sustains more missionaries, has built more railroads and telegraphs than any other nation; whose appliances and inventions for saving labor, as printing presses, mowing, reaping, and sewing machines, are penetrating every civilized land; whose mammoth cannon and invulnerable ships of war are the wonder and the fear of the world; America, where for two hundred and fifty

years, planted by the most enterprising sons of the old world, there has been growing up a system of government, of social order, and of Christian civilization, which we proudly and continually boast is the best the world has ever seen, has not a single school where a painter, sculptor, architect, or musician can be educated. While Germany, with one twelfth of our territory, with a poor soil, with a population impoverished and groaning under the devastations of the thirty years', the seven years', and the Napoleonic wars, and weakened by the constant drain upon the vital forces of the country to be ready for future contests, has eleven academies of the fine arts in general, four conservatories of music, and eight academies of architecture. Nearly all of the twenty-two universities of Germany have professors of esthetics and history of the fine arts, over thirty courses of lectures being given annually in these branches in the single University of Berlin. In nearly all of the more than five hundred gymnasiums and technical schools of that country drawing is taught systematically.

For anything above the merest rudiments and fragmentary instruction in any branch of the fine arts, our students must go to Europe. By a strange inconsistency, our American travelers, Christian and unchristian, ministers, lawyers, and merchants, will walk, lost in wonder and admiration, among the ruins of the monuments of Thebes, Athens, Rome, and the Alhambra; will stand in awe before the Cathedrals of Milan, Strasbourg or Rouen, the Notre-Dame, the Westminster or Melrose Abbey; will ramble with delight through the galleries of the Vatican, of the Louvre, of Florence, Berlin, Munich or London; will listen enchanted to the music of voice and instrument in Germany and Italy: but when they return to America, where commerce is worshiped, where business has her temples, and every man brings his sacrifice to the altar of wealth, they will lift neither hand nor voice to aid a similar development of art in their own land. If they see a young man studying to be a professional artist—a musician, painter, or sculptor—they will either remonstrate with him, or will in their hearts pity him for being such a fool as to throw away his time and talents upon such a trivial occupation; "much better be a lawyer, merchant, engineer, chemist, manufacturer, or shoemaker!"

But we might as well get Germans and Italians to write our hymns as to make our tunes and build our churches; to write our patriotic songs as to make our patriotic statues. If we wish ever to have an art expressive of our own national, social, or religious life, it will only be found to be possible by growing on our own soil, and by being cultivated by our own hands.

But it will be said, and with truth, "Few, if any, of our students in college will become artists," and "why then should they study art?"

How many of those who study astronomy, chemistry, or international law become astronomers, chemists, or embassadors to foreign courts? Shall none study Latin, Greek, geometry, or geology but those who will be professors of these sciences? Shall none but doctors understand physiology; none but lawyers and merchants, the principles and forms of business; none but preachers, the principles of morality; and *none but artists, the laws of taste?*

On the contrary, for a community to be thrifty, the principles of social and political economy must be understood and practiced by that community; to be healthy, they must know and obey the laws of hygiene; to be virtuous, they must know and practice the principles of religion and morality. These must be so engrafted and ingrown as to become a part of the daily life—a part of the very being, of the existence—of a community. So, especially in a republic like ours, where every man has his house, where every parlor has its piano, every church its organ, every city its band; where civilization is spreading rapidly over our boundless prairies and golden sierras, building up, as if by magic, cities in a day and villages in a night; where in the longer settled parts, the log-cabin is being replaced by the stately mansion, the humble meeting-house by the massive stone church with lofty spire and pealing organ, the old stage house by the noisy railroad depot and the city-like hotel, a good art is only possible where there exists a generally diffused and highly cultivated taste.

The graduates of our colleges are to be, more than any other persons, the moulders, the directors, the cultivators of this taste. They are to be our editors—and will praise, condemn, or criticise in the columns of their journals every work of art that appears. They are to be our orators—in the pulpit, in the

lecture-room, on the rostrum, at the bar, and in the halls of legislation, having thus that important branch of the fine arts, eloquence, almost entirely in their hands. As choristers, directors of musical associations, and pastors, they will largely direct the future of our social, secular, and religious music. Rising to prominence in every department of life, they are to act as commissioners or trustees in the erection of buildings for schools, academies, colleges, universities, churches, hospitals for the sick, private or state charitable institutions for the blind, deaf and dumb, and insane. On behalf of the commonwealth, they are to be charged with the erection of edifices for the county, state, and nation. They are to decide upon the adorning of these buildings with paintings and statuary, and upon the tasteful laying out of parks and other public grounds. As enterprising and successful men of business, they are to decide upon the architectural style of their own warehouses, stores, factories, hotels, station-houses and other buildings connected with railroads and other corporate bodies. First and foremost in every enterprise, they will especially need all the qualifications for the performance of their various duties. As many of these duties will thus require of them a high esthetic culture this should be secured to them in their college course, for after they enter upon their professional life they do not and they cannot get it.

But we are a very practical people; Europeans call us very material. We will look a moment at the material advantages to be derived from a study of the fine arts. We will, of course, exclude the professional study of art, and speak only of some of the most manifest advantages that persons, other than artists, will derive from having both a knowledge of the general principles of art, and also a moderate skill in the use of the pencil and brush. The surveyor, machinist, landscape-gardener, and mechanic will find the few hours and dollars spent in learning the rudiments of drawing and design to be the cheapest and most profitable investment they can make. To the topographical engineer, the inventor, and the architect, a knowledge of mathematical drafting is of course indispensable. By having a skillful use of the pencil, the man of science can record his discoveries better than any artist to whom he may communicate his ideas. The professor in every branch of science

can illustrate his instruction with a few lines on the blackboard better than by a long circumlocution of words. The traveler, with a few strokes of the pencil, can catch the prominent points of a landscape, a building, a statue, or a painting, and thus make his heart beat with joy at the memory of his travels years after his return to his home. The minister of the Gospel, with a knowledge of design, can plan a church far more fitting to its purpose than can the architect by business profession, who is often an unbeliever, and almost always mercantile in his views. Thus did the priests of Egypt. And they developed their system of heathen temple architecture far more perfectly than that of Greece or Rome. So did the priests and monks in the middle ages, and under their hands was developed the Romanesque or early Gothic, the most perfect style of Christian architecture the world has yet seen. It is as appropriate for the minister to design churches for the people to worship in as for him to write hymns for the people to sing, or tunes to sing the hymns by. But, as but few ministers have genius for composing music or poetry, so also but few will develop a talent for architecture.

But there are other considerations, higher, more noble, more inspiring, than any relations of time or of this world, to which all of these are subsidiary and subservient. A peasant selected by his king to serve in the royal palace is little annoyed by the meager life of his humble cottage, but his heart is full of the dignity of his new office, and he gives himself up to preparation to appear properly before his monarch and to there perform the duties of his office acceptably. Pilgrims to a land

> "Whose glories shine so bright, no mortal eye can bear the sight,"

where we "shall see the king in his beauty," and serve around his throne, the circumstances of our life here below are of small consideration in comparison to the glories we shall see when "mortality has put on immortality," and we shall have entered upon the happiness and the occupations of our eternal existence.

Enoch, Paul, Luther, Wesley, and Edwards entered doubtless immediately upon a higher state of life in heaven than the thief on the cross, or any other person who repented at the eleventh hour. The highly cultivated or deeply learned Christian philosopher or scientist, as Isaac Newton, Thomas Dick,

or Bishop Berkeley, will enter upon a higher state of spiritual existence than should they die in infancy, or with dwarfed intellects. So the Christian artist, as Giotto, Fra Angelico, Milton, Handel, or Mozart, is more prepared to appreciate the music of the heavenly hosts, the beauty and the glory of the new Jerusalem, than should he die in infancy, or should his sensibilities be obtuse or uncultivated.

And more—if we as true Christians can need such a motive, can need to be whipped to duty—when we are called to give an account of our stewardship, the recording angel will not forget to ask whether we have developed all, or buried some of the faculties with which the Creator has endowed us.

Having thus touched upon some of the advantages, the enjoyments, and the duties of a symmetrical development of our spiritual nature—of our moral, scientific, and esthetic faculties alike—let us glance hastily at the means by which this, with us, so much neglected esthetic culture is to be obtained. It is to be acquired by the same method as moral or scientific culture, by appropriate education and development.

In making a comparative survey of the fine arts in America, and using this word in its broadest sense, we find that oratory far overtops the other arts, both in the attention given it in our schools, and in the successful application of it. No European country can compare with America to-day in the number and excellence of its orators in the pulpit and on the forum. Belle-lettres literature is taught extensively; that of our own country and England merely is well appreciated; but we cannot boast of many good writers of poetry or romance. Music is taught in many schools, and, of a low order, it is widely diffused throughout all classes of society. We have no first-class American composers, nor are oratorios either sung or appreciated much, even in our large cities. All of our colleges should have professorships of oratory, belles-lettres, and music. These should be taught historically, theoretically, and practically.

But it is in the formative and applied arts, as painting, sculpture, and architecture, that the deficiency in our system of education is the most flagrant; and it is more especially with reference to these that we wish to treat. It is true that in many of our public and private schools, drawing and painting are taught. But how are they taught? In the most cursory,

mechanical, and unartistic way; not receiving one quarter of the time given to arithmetic, grammar, or any other elementary study; being pushed into any spare hour that the student who has a special love for art can find; ranked as "ornamental," in distinction from the solid or serious studies; and considered by a large majority of teachers, parents, and patrons as an unimportant, if not a trivial and frivolous, or indeed a vain and noxious appendage to the education of a person of dignity of character. Still the importance of the fact is not to be underrated, that drawing and painting are taught in any manner in our primary schools and academies. Having secured a foothold, they will gain ground with the advancing public taste. As those who are now in the primary schools and the academies enter college, they will wish to continue their studies on a higher basis. Thus there will be created a demand for professorships, and the demand will be supplied.

Instruction in esthetics and the fine arts, to be systematic, should be of three kinds, theoretical, practical, and historical. The theoretical will include the general science of esthetics, or the philosophy of the beautiful; its place in a system of philosophy; the classification, methods, scope, spirit, and mutual relations of the different fine arts, as music, poetry, oratory, painting, sculpture, architecture; and of the applied arts, as landscape gardening, mechanical and topographical drawing, the ornamentation of carpets, wall paper, furniture, machinery, dress, and everything that can receive life, grace, and beauty from the hand of art.

From a lack of thorough instruction in preparatory schools, elementary instruction will have to be given in the practical use of the pencil and the brush; also in the application of mathematics to drawing, in isometrical and linear perspective, and in architectural, mechanical, and topographical drawing.

To the general scholar, to the man of culture, the study of the great intellectual forces that have moulded the civilization of the world, is one of the greatest interest and importance. With such, the historical study of the development, the rise, perfection, and decadence of the fine arts in the different nations and ages of the world, opens the mind to the most glorious as well as the most sad epochs of human greatness and weakness. Without a knowledge of this element in

human history, much of history must be blank, more must be enigmatical, and all is incomplete. Egypt without her temples, tombs, and pyramids; Athens without the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, the Propyleum, the temples of Theseus and Jupiter; Rome without the Capitol, the Coliseum, the baths, the temples, and the tombs; Pompeii without its statuary and paintings; Constantinople without the Santa Sophia, the cisterns, the hippodrome, and the mosques; Florence without its cathedral, city-hall, churches, statuary, paintings, and palaces; Cologne without its cathedral and Romanesque churches; Venice without its St. Mark's Church and tower, ducal palace, library building, marble palaces, and brilliant paintings; in fact, any and all historic countries and cities, without their monuments of art, would be stripped of a great portion of the strange charm that draws to them travelers from all lands. We cry out against the destruction of works of art by the Vandals. How much less would the immeasurably greater portion of the men of learning in America know of the works of ancient art, the spirit that gave them birth, the circumstances of their creation, and their influence upon the art of succeeding ages, had the Vandals destroyed every work of classical architecture, sculpture, and painting, than they do now?

A distinguished member of the New York bar, a graduate of a college in New England that claims to be the best in America, while in Italy lately, declared that he had never heard of Leonardo da Vinci, and by the way he talked it was demonstrated that he certainly never had, though his German and Italian companions could hardly believe their ears. The death of Cornelius, the patriarch of modern painting, fell this year like a cloud of darkness upon cultivated circles in Europe. In America nobody seemed to know there had ever lived such a man as Cornelius. Unless the history of fine arts, and their relation to the general history of civilization is taught in our colleges, this deficiency in the education of the cultivated classes will continue; educated Americans abroad will continue to appear ignorant of the first elements of culture; one great branch of the stream of civilization will flow away from us; our knowledge of historical and contemporary art will continue to be borrowed; and one third of our knowledge of history will be a blank, or a mixture of crude and detached data.

For the study of the history of the fine arts and their relation to the general history of civilization, text-books for class recitation are needed. Of such we have no trustworthy ones in this country. Till these are given, instruction must be given by lectures from the professor. These should be extended through about half of the last year of collegiate instruction. More, the other branches of study would not admit. As much time as this is given to astronomy, for example, or many other studies not more important for the development of the mind, and its furnishing with useful information, than the subject of which we are treating.

These lectures on the history of art should be supplemented by museums of archæology and art history. Such museums are attached to many universities of the old country. The great royal museum of Berlin is now used as an appendage to the university for the illustration of the lectures of the professors upon the history of the fine arts. It is possible to procure a very acceptable museum to illustrate the characteristic periods of architecture, sculpture, and painting among all peoples and of all ages, at a moderate outlay, at much less than is appropriated to the gathering of cabinets of mineralogy, geology, or zoology, or in the apparatus to illustrate physics and chemistry. The laws that govern the crystallization of formless matter, that have governed the developments of animal and vegetable life in the geologic and present periods of the history of the earth, are extremely interesting, and justly require illustration by extensive cabinets and apparatus. Are the laws that have attended the development of humanity in history, are the finest workings of the human spirit, the noblest productions of human genius, of less interest? And is money misappropriated in gathering museums to illustrate these laws, to reproduce these works of genius, so that they may be enjoyed again hundreds and thousands of years after their authors have gone to their last sleep?

A well selected museum of archæology and art history would have as its foundation casts in *plaster of Paris* of the chief works of sculpture, and of the chief architectural ornaments of the different ages of sculpture and architecture. It is impossible now to get good original works of any historic artist of past periods. Copies in plaster are perfect reproductions.

They have none of the defaing and discoloring of the weather-worn originals, and thus for the purpose of study *are better than the originals.* They cost far less and are far more true than copies in marble. At the outset, a few copies in plaster can be obtained. These can be supplemented by photographs of others. These photographs reproduce all the effects of the original from a single point of view. Of many fine works of sculpture no casts have been taken, and we must as yet be content with photographs of them. Most works of architecture must be examined by means of photographs and engravings. The only other or better method is by the use of cork models of buildings, and these are expensive. The study of the history of painting offers more difficulties. Painted copies are expensive and are usually poor. Photographs and engravings give the outline, the drawing, the shading, and the composition, but they lack color, a vital element in painting. Still it is better beyond comparison to have the advantage to be gained from photographs and engravings than to know nothing of the history of painting.

Thus, by the additon of the theoretical, practical, and historical study of the fine arts, by a placing esthetics and the fine arts on a level with philosophy and science, and with theology and morals, by the symmetrical development of the trinity in our spiritual nature—the good, the true, and the beautiful—we will have a system of education that will develop a symmetry and perfection of culture and civilization that has been attained in no past age.

Art. VIII.—OUR MINISTRY.

Apostolical Succession.

The Christian ministry is of God. No pope or president, bishop or moderator, has any authority to call men to this service. It rests not with any conclave, convocation, conference, or general assembly. And no man has any right to conclude, from his acuteness as a logician, ripeness as a scholar, or volubility as an orator, that he is fitted for this work. To call

and to qualify, is the exclusive and inalienable prerogative of the Holy Spirit. Feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers. Ministers of all Christian denominations profess to have been "moved by the Holy Ghost." But there are those who contend that the right of the ministry belongs exclusively to men ordained by bishops who have descended in unbroken succession from the apostles of Christ. We might ask here, Is it likely that the Holy Spirit would suspend the perpetuation of his own institution on the will or whim of fallible mortals? If so, then, were such bishops to decline putting their hands on any more heads, there would be no valid efficacious ministry in the world when the present generation of ministers had entered into rest. If this be true, the New Testament is silent on it. No intimation is there given that we are to receive no minister unless he can trace an uninterrupted succession through eighteen centuries. There is no evidence that the necessary registers were kept by the early Churches. As there were twelve apostles, there may be twelve apostolical successions as well as one. If it be said the succession is derived only from Peter, who was the founder and first bishop of Rome, it has never been proved that he was ever in Rome. There is no mention of Peter in Paul's epistle to the Romans. If he had not at that time been at Rome, he could not have been the founder of the Church there, nor its first bishop. And if there at the time, Paul sends no salutations to him, but directs others to remedy the disorders that prevailed, which completely overturns Peter's supremacy. Again, the stream that has flowed through Rome has been awfully polluted. Popes have been guilty of the most pernicious errors. Popes have condemned councils, and councils have condemned popes. Popes have contradicted popes. Pope Sixtus V. published a Bible which he said was true, legitimate, authentic, and undoubted; Pope Clement VII. suppressed it, and published another of his own, with three thousand corrections. Many of the popes have been notorious thieves, whoremongers, and perjurers. They have been deposed, and yet kept in the line of succession. There have been two popes at a time, a woman pope, and a period of eighty years without any pope. The uninterrupted succession

is a fable. And if it existed, it would be utterly worthless as it respects any practical or spiritual results. The great Head of the Church has laid down a simpler and a surer rule. By their fruits ye shall know them. No minister has a right to consider himself in the apostolical succession whose ministry is not apostolical, and who is not walking in the steps of the holy apostles.

A Renewed Heart.

We are not about to dwell on the validity of our ministry, nor on the various and important duties of ministers, nor to write a treatise on homiletics, but to offer some hints on preaching to our junior brethren. The first qualification for the ministry is *a renewed heart.* God never sends an unconverted man to convert others. Whom he employs he sanctifies. "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." First disciples, then apostles. "Unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes? I sent them not, therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." He who has not obtained mercy cannot testify to the blessedness of pardon. He who has not been regenerated will never travail in birth for souls. He who has never felt the Gospel to be the power of God unto his own salvation will never be concerned about the salvation of others. He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. He who has entered the office for personal ease has missed his way, and had better return. He who seeks the applause of men is not a servant of Christ. He who preaches for filthy lucre is guilty of sacrilege. Sound, healthy, earnest, active piety is indispensable in a minister. He must not only obtain grace, but grow in grace; must build up himself on his most holy faith, pray in the Holy Ghost, and keep himself in the love of God. If he is cold, how is he to warm the hearts of his hearers? If he preaches in a heavenly frame, they are likely to have the fruits of it.

A Well-Furnished Mind.

The gifts of nature are often a snare to a young man. He, perhaps, has much fluency of speech, a lively imagination, and impassioned feeling. With more ease than he anticipated he can keep the alarum going for some time. This fluency is

often his ruin. He does so well with little effort that he depends upon his natural talent, and neglects self-cultivation. Sound is not always sense. Great fluency of speech may be a poor cover for a remarkable paucity of ideas. High-sounding phrases, on examination, may be destitute of meaning, convey truisms, or express nonsense. A ready speaker is not always a close thinker.

The inferiorly gifted man may aim at high excellence; his more gifted brother may be content to move in a more contracted range, or, even congratulating himself on his talent, stop short before he has hardly begun; and thus, like the hare in the fable, allow himself to be distanced by the despised tortoise. A man eager for knowledge, avaricious of ideas, always, with every power of mind, on full stretch to lay hold on some attainment not yet reached, is the man to make the preacher. He comes to his duty in working trim. His preaching labor is not a spasmodic action, but healthy energy; not periodical excitement, but natural vitality; not the running out of a cistern, but the flowing on of a stream; not the discharge of a Leyden jar, that startles the assembly, but the steady action of the galvanic trough, that is as continuous and permanent as the occasion requires. We would impress it upon our junior brethren, that if they would set others thinking they must think for themselves. A vast mass of matter may be but a lump of clay. It is the mind of the preacher that alone can vitalize the mass and energize it. A discourse is the fruit of thought; it is the creation of mind; it is the publication of the travels of a mind which has, for the first time, entered a region to make its own observations on the country and its products, whether that region has been traveled by others or not.

Sermonizing.

A preacher should make all his reading, studies, observations, and experience bear on his pulpit exercises. A physician is expected to be acquainted with medicine, a solicitor with law, a ship-captain with navigation, and a preacher with theology and the best method of communicating knowledge to his hearers. Three things are necessary to a good sermon: the matter must be important; it must arise out of the text; it

must be naturally arranged. If these three characteristics are found in a sermon, it is good; if any one of them is wanting, it may be a good essay, oration, or lecture, but it is not a good sermon. There are subjects, political, literary, scientific, very suitable to the college, the court, the senate, that are felt to be quite out of place in the pulpit. A preacher of the Gospel is expected to confine himself to the Gospel: its sublime doctrines, pure precepts, noble examples, inestimable privileges, and glorious discoveries. Christ Jesus the Lord, in the splendors of his divine perfections, the purity, activity, and beneficence of his life; the ignominy, agony, and atoning efficacy of his death; the triumph and magnificence of his ascension, and the exclusiveness, prevalence, and perpetuity of his intercession, must stand out in distinct and attractive prominence; must be the preacher's grand theme, the center of the circumference he traverses, the sun of the system he explores. The Gospel, and the Gospel only, contains the remedy for the world's malady; and is best understood, felt, relished by persons of all classes, from the least unto the greatest. In a neighborhood where we labored some time ago, an idiot boy who was observed regularly to attend the Methodist Chapel, while his relatives frequented a different place of worship, was one day asked his reason for the preference, when he promptly replied, "Because there it is Christ, Christ, Christ, and *all* may come." The duke of Sussex informed our sainted friend Adam Clarke, that the bishop of Salisbury, having procured a young man of promising abilities to preach before George III., the bishop in conversation afterward, wishing to get the king's opinion, said, "Does not your majesty think that the young man who had the honor to preach before your majesty is likely to make a good clergyman, and has this morning delivered a very good sermon?" To which the king in his blunt manner hastily replied, "It might have been a good sermon, my lord, for aught I know, but I consider no sermon good that has nothing of *Christ* in it." No man can be considered a good preacher who does not understand the Christian theology. His views of the character of Christ will give the complexion to his preaching. There is an intimate relation subsisting between the truths of the Gospel. One error leads to many; and as the tendency of false principles is progressive, none of

them can be considered as perfectly harmless. But they become highly dangerous when they affect our views of Christ. Mistakes here, whether they relate to his person or to his prophetical, sacerdotal, or regal offices, may be equally injurious to his glory, and subversive of those principles which should ever influence our hearts and regulate our lives. Unless a preacher clearly perceives the connection, relation, and dependence of the various parts of the Christian system, he will be sure to fail in precision and luminousness of definition and of statement. We once heard a minister at a conference preach on repentance. He said there was a legal repentance and an evangelical repentance, and that he should give an example of each. Of the former he adduced the Philippian jailer, who said, "What must I do to be saved?" Of the latter he presented Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened." But the preacher knew not what he said, or whereof he affirmed.

The matter of a sermon should flow from the text. We have heard a popular minister in no mean city preach from "A bundle of myrrh is my well-beloved unto me." He said some good things, but not one of them was to be found in the text. On another occasion we heard a minister of some note from "I am black but comely, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon," which he said meant that the believer was black with sin as the tents of Kedar, but comely in Christ as the curtains of Solomon; an awful perversion of the text. At another time from "The inhabitant shall not say, I am sick." This he explained to mean, the Christian was sick with sin, but that he would not complain of it. From such apostles, O ye mitered heads, preserve the Church! A preacher should never take a text which he does not understand. Nor a text which, out of its proper connection, can mean nothing. He should give the literal meaning of it, and never appear to contradict the Holy Spirit. And whether he treats his subject by formal division, proposition, or observation, he should be always perfectly natural: proceeding from the less to the greater, from the duty to the promise, from the race to the prize.

Naturalness.

Preachers in all their pulpit exercises should be *natural*. Every man has his own way of expressing his ideas. His own

way may not be perfect; it probably has defects, some of which time, thought, admonition will correct. But, in every case, the mode of expression natural to an individual is the best which that individual can adopt. Imitation is at once servile and inimical to ministerial variety. Material nature presents not a uniformity of aspect and condition. Variety is their charm. It illustrates the resources of the Creator. No two heads are shaped and sized exactly alike. The human face is confined to a certain extent of boundary; its principal parts are alike in number, and in their relative position to each other. Yet, numberless as they are, two faces were never formed exactly alike. God intends each man to be distinguished from his fellow, that he shall have a personal difference, and be perfectly distinct from the rest of his kind.

The same diversity of mind characterizes man. We are not all thrown into the same mould. Our mental conformation is endlessly varied. Every man has his own mode of thinking, his own way of expression. How widely do the bishops of our Church differ from each other. Simpson does not express himself as Ames, nor Scott as Janes. The mental conceptions of Morris are as diverse from those of Baker, as the compositions of Thomson are distinct from the productions of Clark and Kingsley. The men who give a character to an age—whose writings are stereotyped for the benefit of all generations—whose great claim to notice is their originality, grafted on genius—are not, like greenbacks, struck off the same plate, and distinguished only by the numeral accidentally engraven on them. Each is himself. Each stands alone, and separate, in his own identity. Each speaks for himself. Each enunciates his own thoughts. Each is a divine oracle, God speaking through the human instrument, and each of these instruments presenting that phase of thought for which his own mental structure peculiarly and distinctly fitted him.

The pulpit should present this natural, agreeable, instructive, useful variety. Artificial perfection is not wanted there. A close imitation of what men of any particular school may deem a model, is a loss of pulpit power and a waste of public resources. Variety of mind requires variety of modes of expression. The canal may be cut straight and uniform, for

it is artificial: but the river, whether it rises from a quiet spring, or oozes from the mountain side, or rushes with the force of a torrent from the fissure of the rock, cuts its own channel, and distinguishes itself from every other stream by its bendings and its windings, its narrow gorges and its broad places of waters; and thus gives to itself a beauty and variety peculiarly its own, and sufficient, in the eye of the lovers of nature, to make it an object of interest and admiration. The glory of the Mississippi is one, and the glory of the St. Lawrence is another. The Ohio differs from the Hudson, and the Susquehanna from the Connecticut. But each is invested with interest to the tourist and traveler, because each has original peculiarities.

The stream of thought runs through men's minds with similar variety of form and mode when man acts with the freedom and grace of natural aptitude and peculiarity. He who thinks for himself views every object from his own position. Each man has his own way of painting these mental visions. His style may not be the best in the world, but it is best for himself. He is most at home in it, and no man can make others feel at home unless he feels at home himself. There is an ease in this natural style of thought and of expression, and this ease is imparted to an audience. If all preachers could most successfully imitate some supposed model of original thinking and of pulpit eloquence, so that a hearer, with his eyes shut, could not distinguish whether he was listening to the original or to his disciple, the gain of this perfection of thought and style would be as irreparable a loss to the world of mind as uniformity of color, shape, magnitude, position, in any department of nature, would be in the world of matter.

The pulpit is in danger of suffering in power and efficiency by the practice that obtains in some institutions formed for the training of candidates for the ministry. These compose sermons designed, not to arouse dying men to the interests of eternity, but to be submitted to the inspection of a professor, whose approval of this artificial substitute for a sermon is likely to be the chief object of solicitude with the student. The professor has his own notions of what a sermon should be, and his own rules whereby the structure which will meet with his commendation may be raised by the novice for perfection

or approbation. Thus formal, stiff, cold, lifeless, cramped works of art may, as a rule, be apprehended, instead of the easy and varied grace and power of nature. The structure will be artificial. Long rows of buildings, made on the same plan, will take the place of cottages, villas, mansions, each separated and surrounded by its own inclosure, displaying the taste and resources of its owner, and giving grateful variety to the landscape. An essay rather than a sermon would be the probable result. Close adherence to the professor's rules of composition, rather than a free play of native powers, allowed to range at liberty through the regions of truth which the subject naturally opens to the thinker; a dwarf rather than a full-grown man; the grave rather than the womb of thought. Nature has given no other model than her own ceaseless variety; and if the *alma mater* of any class of ministerial candidates produces a tendency to uniformity, the Church will sustain a loss for which no scholarship or collegiate instruction will ever compensate. Let the young preacher possess distinct ideas, forcible language, religious feeling, and by the grace of God he will be no post in the pulpit. His active mind will generate activity in other minds.

A preacher who wishes his sermon to be effective must have *clear and distinct ideas of his subject.* He cannot impart what he does not himself possess. If his mind views intellectual truths as vaguely as the eye perceives material objects in a hazy atmosphere, it is impossible for him to impart a clear outline and well-defined forms of truth to his audience. His discourse will be foggy, confused, perplexing. He knows not what he is doing. His harangue is a play upon words when it should be a collection of ideas. The audience is occupied with sound when it should be instructed, exercised, gratified with sense. He does not understand himself; how then can he make others understand him? Clear ideas are requisite to good sermonizing. Let a preacher see his way clearly into a subject, through a subject, and around a subject; let him have a vivid outline of it in his own mind; let the several truths of which it is composed be distinctly set, as in a picture, before his mental vision, and he will have little difficulty in conveying these apprehensions to others. He will have set the type; his audience receives the impression.

There are preachers whose discourses ever fail in conveying a knowledge of truth to their audience. They are never understood. It is not that they soar into regions of thought, or that they dive into profundities of truth, into which the inferior capacity of their hearers denies them entrance. It is not that their language is a departure from an easy style. In these respects they are common-place enough. The idea may be puerile; a child's caliber of intellect would have been adequate for its emission; a peasant could have hardly used a more homely style. Nevertheless, no one understands the preacher; no one understands the discourse; no one carries away the sermon. He has been beating the air. His audience gaped, not with admiration, but at inanity. The preacher did not understand himself, and therefore could not empower others to understand him. Destitute himself of clear apprehension, he could not impart distinct notions to others. His own mind confused and muddy, all that came off from it was confused and muddy too. The stream could not rise above its source; it passed through no filter from the fountain to the receiving vessels. An audience should have no difficulty in comprehending what the preacher means. In order to this the preacher must know what he is about, and whereabouts he is. He must have in his own mind, and present with him, clear, well-defined ideas, of which his language is but the exponent. Opaque bodies intercept light. Confusion of ideas in the speaker begets confusion in the hearer. A definite meaning for each term employed, a clear apprehension of every idea adduced, a mental outline distinctly formed of the truth embodied in the discourse, will convey knowledge to the mind with as much certainty as light falling upon the eye produces the vision of material objects.

Plainness.

Preachers should use *great plainness of speech.* Words are of use only as signs of ideas. Their usefulness consists in their expressing the ideas which it is sought to convey to other minds. Some preachers seek for words that are most rarely used, and more rarely understood. Hard and polysyllabic words are the favorites when there is a simple word that expresses the same sentiment, and will be universally under-

stood, but which is passed by, apparently for no other reason than that it is the very word which will be comprehended by every one that hears it. Great minds have great ideas, and will seek to convey their ideas in words of common comprehension. The extremest simplicity may be the truest sublimity. Vast thoughts require no bombast to set them off. Only misshapen bodies, and persons wanting in symmetry, need the *adornment* of dress. Large-sounding words often conceal a wretched nakedness of thought. Great truths need not this artificial glare any more than the light of day can be aided by the taper. God said, "Light be! and light was." It requires not the voice of Longinus, the Greek critic, to point out the sublimity of this simplicity. The wisest men use the plainest terms. Learned phrases do not make a learned man. Great-swelling words not only indicate "vanity" of heart, but are often the result of emptiness of head. Having but little of sense to give, there must be presented the more sound. Preachers fond of hard words are oftener ignorant of their meaning than capable of using them. Their misapplication of such words is often grossly ludicrous, and an unmistakable evidence of ignorance. Wishful to impress on others their great wisdom, they stamp themselves as fools. Fishing for admiration of their superior attainments, they fall into deserved contempt. They have gone out of their depth. They have taken into their hands weapons with the use of which they are ignorant. The scholar is wiser than the teacher; for the former sees what the latter knows not—that the instructor is ignorant of the terms he employs.

The preacher should also avoid the turgid, bombastic, stilted style of speaking. He who adopts it never appears himself. All is artificial. He abounds in flowers of speech. He lacks the fruit of thought. He is more anxious to show himself off than to instruct others in the truth. He places himself before his congregation as an idol. Incense to himself appears to be his chief object. He misses his aim. Sensible men have little relish for this artificial glitter. Instead of admiration it produces disgust. Instead of homage done to his greatness, contempt is awakened at his vanity. Instead of amazement at his brilliancy, men feel horror-struck that a frail mortal has the temerity to seek applause while standing

in the holy place. We say, then, to our young preachers, Be natural. Express yourselves inartificially. Aim at perspicuity. Strive that every one may know your meaning. Ideas, not words, enrich a discourse. The mental soil is seldom rich where the preacher has to labor hard for words. It is the poverty of ideas that drives the speaker to the necessity of covering over the scantiness of thought by the delusive glare of high-sounding phrases, and by the worthless drapery of bombastic forms of speech. Scholars do not want them, and the uneducated cannot understand them. The educated want thoughts that are suggestive, and that will awaken and exercise their own mental activity; the uneducated want thoughts in such language as they can easily comprehend. Fine words are despised by the one class, and are lost upon the other.

All our best and most useful preachers, such as Wesley and Fletcher, Benson and Clarke, Asbury and M'Kendree, have been easy to be understood. They thought clearly and therefore spoke intelligibly. And as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts. Many persons go to Church not to be instructed but gratified, not to be sanctified but flattered; and if a preacher seeks to be popular with such hearers, it is only for him to avoid the common topics of repentance, faith, holiness, and spend his time in quoting pretty poetry, telling lively anecdotes, investigating some unimportant fact of history, some date in chronology, some discovery in philosophy, and in exhibiting some flowers of rhetoric, without touching a besetting sin, or leaving a scar on the conscience, and, *verily, he has his reward;* but will he receive from the Lord of all the plaudit, *Well done, thou good and faithful servant?* All unnecessary offense should be avoided. The threatenings of the law, the sentence of eternal death, should not be denounced as if the preacher were in a passion, and felt pleasure in consigning sinners to perdition, but with the utmost solemnity, with a trembling hand and a faltering voice.

Reading and Reciting.

We have frequently been asked by young preachers whether they should put *their thoughts upon paper* before delivering

them to a congregation; and if so, to what extent they should write their sermons. Discourses really extempore are probably but rarely delivered. More or less preparation is not only general, but creditable. A preacher should give his congregation the result of his best attention to the subject on which he designs to speak, or his discourses will soon be vague, loose, common-place, and presenting but little variety of matter. He should understand the passage, its drift, the uses to which it can be best applied, and the most effective way by which to bring its contents to interest his hearers, and to secure their instruction and edification. To write beforehand an outline of his intended discourse may be attended with some advantage. It remains ready for use, when, if intrusted to the memory, much of it might be erased from the mind. The possession of a well-arranged outline serves to give a preacher a good degree of self-possession. Good thoughts, which the mind has worked out for itself, form valuable intellectual treasure. It would be a pity to lose it. Few memories could retain it. In the course of years it may become invaluable. To have lost it would be a more grievous loss than that of silver or gold.

In writing down the outline of a sermon, the aim of the young composer should be to crowd in the greatest number of appropriate and weighty truths, arranged so as to assist him and his congregation in an orderly walking up to his subject, and an orderly examination and full apprehension of it. He should aim not at fine phrases, but at vigorous conceptions of thought; not at pretty arrangements of words, but at having masses, ingots of arguments, sentiments, and uses, ready lying for immediate occupation, and in sufficient plenty to prevent the necessity of employing tinsel as a covering for the nakedness of the discourse.

The manuscript should not be taken into the pulpit and read to the audience. This mode of address is unnatural, and calculated to defeat the great object of preaching. To deliver a discourse verbatim from manuscript is also an evil. The habit of writing out a sermon fully, and of giving it a fine finish, consumes a large portion of time. It is an excessive burden to the memory. It gives much stiffness to the

delivery. It cramps the energies of the mind. It makes the preacher think of his manuscript when he should be lost in his subject. If any new thoughts are suggested to him in the course of its delivery he is timid, and inapt to follow them out. He has tied himself down to so many lines, and so many words; and if he get out of the beaten road he may find it difficult to get back to it, if he do not, indeed, lose himself in the new course of thought that has been awakened. When a man is working out an important thought before an intelligent and sympathizing audience, his mental powers have a keenness and energy which the cool quiet of the study will fail to develop. As the result of this intellectual excitement the most uncommon sentiments, the most original turns of thought, the most striking and animated illustrations, and the most happy forms of expression, will give a variety, a force, a brilliancy, an interest, amply repaying the lack of that rhetorical or even logical accuracy which *memoriter* preachers sometimes acquire, and which they perhaps affect to admire. The habitual dependence of the preacher upon the tenacity of his memory hazards his dependence on the help of the Holy Spirit, and his aptness to avail himself of circumstances the occurrence of which, when adroitly used, give him an immense power over his audience. His thoughts are all chiseled out. His forms of expression are all stereotyped. There is no flexibility in his discourse. He must confine himself to what he has written—accurate it may be, but it wants ease. He does not create thought as he passes on, he only uses what he has already in preparation. Occasionally a junior preacher may write out a sermon in full. It may assist him in correcting any gross impropriety of style. But in all probability it is the sermon which, after a few years, he will most rarely preach, though it has cost him most labor to produce it. He will not much relish traveling over the same beaten path. He will grow weary of his own uniformity.

Every preacher should preach *his own sermons.* As the congregations expect his own, he should give them his own; never practice a deceit by appearing in another's dress, but give his hearers the produce of his own sweat, the result of his own brain. He should beat out his own oil, and with it light up the sanctuary, when it is his turn to serve the priest's office.

He who shows himself off with another man's mental wealth injures himself. He is neglecting to cultivate his own estate, which probably is capable of vast improvement, and which, under skillful and diligent management, might yield rich returns. If God has called a man to preach he has given him the ability, if he daily improve his opportunities, to edify those to whom he is sent. Let him make his own outlines, shape his own course. If the matter is in him it will come out. Time, thought, reading, observation, use, will teach him to throw the material into the most useful form, and to present it in the most edifying manner.

Some sermons are a singular piece of patchwork. They consist of a paragraph from one author, a scrap from another, a section from a third, portions from several. They shine in all the colors of the rainbow. They are enriched, like a cabinet, with curiosities and specimens from every part of the world. Joseph stands in the pulpit in a coat of many colors; it is patchwork; every patch has been filched. The man has not obtained the raw material, woven it by his own industry into a seamless garment, and given it by his own skill its varied and splendid hues. It is very fine! But when his "elegant extracts" are exhausted, and he is obliged to fill up and speak for himself, there is a baldness, a meagerness, a chaffiness, that contrast most painfully with the wealth and taste which he has displayed. "Alas, master, it was borrowed!"

Preachers should not only preach their own sermons, but always be *making new ones.* They should not be content with a few, preaching them over and over again to wearisomeness. The old sermons should not be thrown away indiscriminately, for some of them will be equal to the new ones. There are seasons when a man thinks with more than ordinary vigor; when he discriminates with more than ordinary clearness; when he composes with unusual force; when he is aided from above in an extraordinary degree. Sermons thus prepared are not to be used once or twice and then for ever laid aside. But he who would speak unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort, must ever be intent on making fresh sermons. Society is on the advance. Knowledge is increasing. His own mind must not be cramped. He must

advance in knowledge, in aptitude to teach, and in grace. He should always have a fresh piece of metal on the anvil. However large and however valuable the stock in hand, so long as mind is improvable, so long as knowledge is exhaustless, so long as perfection is not attained, let the preacher elaborate from time to time truth from its purest materials and sources, and as a wise steward bring forth things new and old. Thus did Adam Clarke and Richard Watson, so that their ministry was fresh, instructive, and acceptable to the end of their useful and laborious lives.

Earnestness.

In a preacher nothing can be a substitute for *intense earnestness*. He may be an acute logician, a profound metaphysician, a sound critic, a graceful orator; but he will never be a successful minister unless he is deeply imbued with religious feeling. A sermon is not an essay, a treatise, a lecture. Its object is not simply an exposition of truth; still less is it a display of intellectual strength or of mental resources. The preacher comes not into the pulpit in the garb of a philosopher or scholar. His business is not to display his logic or science, to excite the admiration and call forth the applause of his audience. Infinitely more momentous is his work, incalculably more solemn are his responsibilities. His business is to save souls from death. His congregations consist of those who will be eternally saved or eternally damned; of those to whom the broad road leading to destruction has many attractions, while they are alienated from the narrow road leading to eternal life; of those who, ere long, will have entered upon their unchanging condition of immortal being. The sermon may be the savor of life unto life, or the savor of death unto death. Eternal realities should seize and engross the mind of the preacher. *A soul saved! a soul lost!*—these two living forms of immortality should stand upon his study-table. The salvation of the one, the damnation of the other, traceable to his skill, to his earnestness, to his application, or to his want of these characteristics, should speak to his inmost soul, calling from their profoundest depths his sympathies and his sense of responsibility.

The religious feeling of a preacher should not be a mere

desire to save souls, it should amount to a *passion;* it should partake of the energy, the ardor, the exclusiveness of *enthusiasm.* In this respect he should be a man of one idea. The first, the all-engrossing, the all-pervading question should be, how most effectually to promote the salvation of souls. This singleness of eye will save him from all mean and debasing ends emanating from individual vanity and ministering to personal pride. It will give a singular earnestness and simplicity to his efforts, and will levy contributions on all his resources; and whether he be argumentative, imaginative, literary, or scientific, the energy and sympathy awakened by an impressive sense of the value of souls will press into his service all his intellectual powers and riches, that he may warn sinners to flee from the wrath to come, and persuade them to seek a crown of glory that fadeth not away. It is said of the seraphic William Bramwell that he was accustomed to look into the great realities of existence. He saw that here there was little else but shadow and vapor; all transitory, provisional, probationary. Life is a preface—to what? We are hurrying onward—whither? Our predecessors, have they not passed away? Ourselves, what is to become of us? One generation after another makes its appearance on the broad highway of existence, marches on with rapid step, filling the air with its shouts, and then vanishes in darkness. What has become of it? Its myriads are somewhere, doing something! Are living, thinking, feeling, suffering, or rejoicing at this moment! So will they be millions of ages hence—living, thinking, feeling, suffering, or rejoicing still! Bramwell looked at man, and found within him an immortal spirit; at time, and saw that it was but a fragment of eternity; at death, and discovered that it was an antechamber to heaven or hell. Here the vision of his soul was truly telescopic. His long-sighted faculty gauged the depths of being as far as they were accessible to mortal ken, and descried those dread realities of which so few ever catch a proper glimpse until they burst upon the view of the disembodied soul. He seemed to penetrate the mist that hovered over that shadowy land. There he saw a judgment seat, and one terrible of aspect who sat thereon; culprits dragged to the bar, the roll of crime unfolded, the look of unutterable despair as the awful sentence

was pronounced, and the unavailing struggle of the victim as the tormentors bore him away to undying misery! And yonder, too, his mental vision traveled up to the very gates of heaven, and placed before him the Lamb as newly slain, and the worshiping hosts that encompass the shining throne. His soul seemed in some measure to reflect the light which gleamed upon it from those far-off realities. His thoughts and words were drawn from the depths of being. His voice was a voice from another world. His dialect was a kind of compound of the terrestrial and celestial tongues. Like the man who dwells on the confines of two great kingdoms, the national characteristics of both were in some degree blended and combined in the same individual; but in this instance the spiritual element had by far the predominant sway, and imbued his whole being with its superior virtue.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Intercommunion between the Anglican, the Eastern, and the Scandinavian Churches.—We have traced in the columns of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" the steady progress of the plan to establish a closer union of the Anglican Churches with both the Eastern Communions (Greek, Armenian, Nestorian, etc.) and the State Churches of the Scandinavian Countries, (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland.) The movement has assumed considerable dimensions, and may yet lead to important results. But it cannot have escaped the attentive observers of the movement, that thus far the Anglicans of Great Britain and the United States have alone been active in it; while the Eastern Churches and the Scandinavians have, on the whole, confined themselves to receiving and examining the Anglican overtures. The Anglican promoters of the movement thus far seem to have but little troubled themselves with the question whether the Eastern and the Scandinavian Churches would like each other's company. It is evident that this question, although altogether overlooked, is one of great importance; and Dr. Pusey has therefore shed new light on the subject by calling the attention of his Church to the circumstance that the Eastern Church will make her communion with the Anglican Churches contingent upon the non-recognition of the Scandinavians by the Anglicans; for he says, the Orthodox Eastern Church has condemned Lutheranism as heretical, and wont have anything to do with either the Lutherans or those who associate with them. His letter, which is addressed to the "Guardian," a High Church paper of London, and which is of the greatest importance for the future of this union question, is as follows:

I have been asked by several, both clergy and laity, with whom I am of one mind, to request you to insert a few lines on a subject which, according to our convictions, deeply affects the well-being of our Church. An energetic party (looking, as we think, to the mere question whether Sweden retains the Episcopal succession, or the Danish body would accept it from us) has for some time been anxious that the Church of England should recognize the Scandinavian bodies, and enter into communion with them. We know that any such recog-

nition would be fatal to any hope of reunion with the Orthodox Eastern Church, such as many of your readers pray and long for. For it has condemned Lutheranism as heretical. But further we believe that any such implied recognition of the errors of Lutheranism (even in ignorance) would be very injurious to our claim to catholicity, and would now, as it did before in the alliance with the King of Prussia about the Jerusalem bishopric, unsettle the minds of many in their allegiance to our own Church. We, therefore, implore such persons, by the mercies of Christ, not to offer violence to our consciences by endeavoring to obtain any such recognition from the bishops to be assembled in September; and we hope that a memorial will be presented to those bishops earnestly deprecating any such recognition so long as those bodies adhere to the Lutheran symbolical books, which we believe contain merely heresy, from which God in his mercy preserve us. I have stated recently some of my grounds for disbelieving even the Swedish succession, in an "Introductory Essay on Reunion." I have alluded to some, though only a few, of their heresies.

Here we have the germ of a new conflict between the Anglican High Church men. They have before been divided on the attitude to be assumed with regard to the Church of Rome, on the introduction of the Ritualistic innovations, and many other points; now the new controversy is added, whether the efforts for establishing an intercommunion with the Scandinavians are to continue or not. Dr. Pusey and his friends fully agree in this, as in almost every question, with the Eastern Churches. They assert that the succession of the Swedish bishops is doubtful, while the Danes have no apostolical succession at all; and that the symbolical books used by all the Lutheran Churches, "contain merely heresy." They desire their Church, therefore, to keep aloof from the Scandinavians as heretics. In the Scandinavian Churches the letter of Dr. Pusey will probably have a great check upon the progress of the union tendencies. It was not without great difficulty that Bishop Whitehouse, of Illinois, one of the foremost High Church bishops in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, gained last year some friends among the Swedes for this movement. He induced the archbishop of Sweden, Dr. Reuterdahl, and several bishops, to be present at the consecration of an Anglican chapel at Stockholm, and to commit themselves otherwise in favor of intercommunion with the Anglican Church. One of the Swedish bishops, Dr. Anjou, vindicated the claims of the Swedish Church to apostolical succession. In order to derive from this tendency at once some practical advantage, Bishop Whitehouse, of Illinois, told the Swedish bishops that if emigrants to the United States had a recommendation from ministers of the Church of Sweden to the Episcopal Church in the United States they would be received in the friendliest manner, and even assisted in case of need. He furnished them accordingly with a formulary, which was to be given to emigrants, and which is as follows: "In case he should settle in any place where access to a congregation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Sweden cannot be had, he is hereby, in the friendliest and most earnest manner, recommended to the bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America for the obtaining of that spiritual and corporal care which he may demand, and of which he may happen to stand in need." The archbishop was gained for this scheme, which, if skillfully carried out, would have carried a large portion of the Swedish Lutherans directly into the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Swedish Lutheran Synod in the United States took alarm at this, and addressed letters for fuller information to prominent men in Sweden for reply. Letters were received from the bishops of Gottenburg and Westerås, and others, which are soon to be published. We already know that in Sweden the Low Church party is strong and active, and ready to combat this "apostolical succession" doctrine of the High Church party. They will, of course, find a powerful ally in the letter of Dr. Pusey, which declares all the Swedish Lutherans, High Church men and Low Church men, heretics. If Pusey's views are sustained by a large portion of Anglican High Church men—and it is likely that they will—there is, of course, an end to the intercommunion scheme between Anglicans and Scandinavians.

GERMANY.

THE PARTIES IN THE PROTESTANT STATE CHURCHES OF GERMANY—THE

GENERAL SYNOD OF BADEN.—The political reconstruction of Germany must sooner or later be followed by a reorganization of the Protestant State Churches. In the old confederation each of the thirty-five independent states had its own Protestant State Church or State Churches, and between these Churches of the several independent states there was no official connection. The great political changes which have already been effected have started two important questions as regards the relations of the several State Churches to each other. The first concerns the relation of the Churches of the States annexed to Prussia, (Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, Frankfort, Schleswig-Holstein,) to the Prussian State Church; the second, the establishment of some closer bond of union between the Protestant Churches of the North German Confederation, and of the independent South German States. As regards the annexed States, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfort had, like Prussia, a united Evangelical Church, formed by the union of Lutherans and German Reformed, and based upon the common points in the creeds of the two denominations. Their incorporation with the State Church of Prussia, which, in the name of the king, is governed by a supreme ecclesiastical council, (*Oberkirchenrath*,) presents, therefore, no great difficulties. But the Churches of Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein, which are strictly Lutheran, are opposed to a communion with the Reformed, and, therefore, also to a common Church government for the two denominations, and the regulation of their Church constitution has already produced violent controversies. A large number of the Lutheran pastors are determined to persist in refusing the admission of members of the Reformed Church to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The Prussian government is again engaged in preparations for completing the constitution of the Prussian Church, by the establishment of a provincial synod for every province, and of a general synod to embrace representatives of every province. The demands for a national German synod, to consist of chosen representatives of the Protestant Churches of all the German states, and the establishment of a supreme executive council for all the states, are also general and urgent.

Within most of the individual State Churches the conflict is between the "Evangelical" school, which desires a strict conformity with the common points of the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions of the sixteenth century, the Lutheran party, which insists on strict adherence to the symbolical books of the Lutherans only; and the "Liberal Union" party, which demands within the national Churches equal rights for the believers in the old confessions of faith, and for those who reject, more or less, the doctrines common to Lutherans, Reformed, and other Evangelical denominations, and claim an absolute right of free inquiry. As but few of the State Churches have elective synods, it is difficult to ascertain the numerical strength of each of the three parties in the several States. At the General Synod of the Grand Duchy of Baden, which was held in May of the present year, the Liberal party numbered forty-two votes against only fourteen belonging to the Evangelical Union party. The synod elected as president Dr. Bluntschli, a professor of law at the University of Heidelberg, and among the prominent members of the majority were Dr. Rothe, Dr. Schenkel, Dr. Hitzig, Dr. Holtzmann, Zittel, all known as theological writers. The synod, by a strict party vote, expressed the opinion that the State Church should embrace, in the enjoyment of equal rights, those "who unconditionally adhere to the views of former centuries, and those who, following the progress of science and civilization, have gained a new standpoint for the exhibition of Christian truth, and convictions accordingly changed."

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

ITALY.

THE ROMAN COUNCIL.—In accordance with the circular letter addressed on December 8, 1866, by the cardinal prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Council of Trent to all the Roman Catholic bishops of the world, a large number of bishops, priests, and laymen from all parts of the world assembled in Rome, in June, to be present at the solemn canonization of several saints. In point of numbers, this was one of the largest assemblies of bishops of which the history of the Roman Catholic Church makes mention. According to

the official list, published in Rome, there were present five cardinal bishops, thirty-two cardinal priests, nine cardinal deacons, six patriarchs, ninety-five archbishops, and four hundred and twenty bishops—in all, five hundred and sixty-seven. All the countries which have Roman Catholic bishops were represented except Russia. From the United States there were present five archbishops and eighteen bishops: from England, eight bishops, with Dr. Manning, archbishop of Westminster, at their head; from Scotland, three bishops; from Ireland, fourteen bishops, commanded by Cardinal Cullen. Turning to the East, all its various rites were represented; as Greeks, Melchites, Roumanians, Ruthenians, Syrians, Chaldæans, Maronites, Armenians, and Copts. There were bishops, too, from India, China, and the islands of the Indian seas. The bishops laid at the feet of the pontiff the offerings of the faithful in the countries from which they came. Their donations in money alone were estimated at about $1,500,000. At the last of the public consistories preceding the canonization the Pope delivered an allocution in which he thus expresses his design to convoke an œcumenical council:

To us, venerable brethren, nothing is more desirable than to glean from your union with the Apostolic See that fruit which we esteem most salutary to the whole Church. We have already entertained for a long time past a project which is known to several of our venerable brethren, and we trust that our thought may be realized as soon as the desired occasion shall present itself. Our project is to hold a sacred œcumenical and general council of all the bishops of the Catholic world, in which, by collecting various opinions, we may by common accord, and with the aid of God, adopt the necessary and salutary remedies, particularly in that which concerns the many evils which now afflict the Church. By means of such a council we have a certain hope that the light of the Catholic truth, dissipating the darkness of error in which the minds of men are involved, will shed abroad its beneficent light, and enable mankind to discern and follow, by favor of the divine grace, the true path of salvation and justice. The Church also will thence derive strength, and, like an invincible army, will defeat the hostile efforts of her enemies, subdue their pride, and, fully triumphing over them, propagate and uphold throughout the world the reign of Christ on earth.

But now, in order that your prayers and your and our cares may bear abundant fruit of justice to Christianity, let us lift up our eyes to God, the fountain of all goodness and justice; to Him who holds for them that hope, all fullness of defense, and all abundance of grace.

The bishops in their reply, as is common on such occasions, only re-echoed the words of the Pope, without giving utterance to any suggestions of their own. They express joy at the proclamation of the speedy assembly of an œcumenical council, from which they expect abundant fruit. As a great many false rumors concerning the drawing up of this reply were circulated in English and American papers, the Roman Catholic bishop of Southwark, in a letter to the "London Times," gave an authentic account of the deliberations of the bishops, which is interesting, as it is the only official statement thus far published. The following is the most interesting portion of the letter:

When an address was projected, the bishops of each nation deputed one or more of their number to represent them in the commission to which body the duty of preparing the address was to be intrusted. The English bishops, eight in number, unanimously selected their archbishop as their leading representative, communicating verbally, and not in writing, to him and to myself, (as his colleague,) their views as to the subjects that would probably be mentioned in the address. They had occasion to state their opinions on other important matters through the archbishop, and throughout the most perfect harmony of opinion existed between him and his colleagues. When the deputies of the different nations met on the 22d of June, Cardinal de Angelis, as senior by consecration, read a draft of fifteen points, which were proposed as the basis of the address. This draft had been prepared by a Roman prelate of high standing under his auspices, and was in Italian. Some of the bishops wished to hear it read in Latin. It was, therefore, read in Latin first by the cardinal bishop of Besançon, and afterward by the archbishop of Colocza in Hungary. It was at once unanimously adopted, the bishop of Gran Varadino, of the Oriental rite, suggesting that the address should contain an expression of the gratitude of the Orientals for the unvarying kindness with which Pius IX. had treated them ever since his election. Following the precedent of 1862, it was then resolved that six prelates, with Cardinal de Angelis at their head, should frame the address, and read it on the following

Wednesday, the 26th of June, to the general commission. The subcommission requested the archbishop of Colocza and the archbishop of Thessalonica to take the fifteen heads approved by the general commission, and to draw up an address founded upon them. After two days their draft was printed, and, with a few verbal alterations, was the same which was signed and presented to his Holiness. Neither in the heads nor in the address was a word contained either of the Czar of Russia or of Victor Emmanuel, and the passage relating to the loyalty of the Romans stands in substance now as it stood then. The address was unanimously accepted by the whole commission. No division or voting on any portion of it was so much as proposed. The address was at once signed by all the bishops in Rome—that is, by more than one half of the whole number of bishops in the Catholic world.

The committee had altogether thirty members, distributed as follows: France, four; Austria, three; Spain, three; Italy, three; England, two; Ireland, two; Belgium, one; Holland, one; Prussia, two; Bavaria, one; Switzerland, one; Portugal, one; North America, three; Brazil, one; Mexico, one; the East, three. The French bishops nominated Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans, Archbishop Regnier, of Cambray, Cardinal de Bonnechose, archbishop of Rouen, and Cardinal Mathieu, archbishop of Beasançon. The Spanish bishops nominated the three eldest of the bishops present. The three members of the committee selected by the Eastern bishops were Patriarch Valerga, of Jerusalem; Hassun, archbishop primate of the Armenians, and Languillat, a vicar apostolic of China.

Art. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

George Müller, the founder of the great Christian institutions at Bristol, is well known throughout the Protestant Churches. An interesting sketch of his life and his work has been published by G. von Polenz. (*Georg Müller.* Halle.)

Dr. Hitzig's Commentary on the Psalms (*Die Psalmen*, Leipzig, 2 vols.) occupies a high rank among German commentaries on the Old Testament as regards his grammatical explanation of the text, and in this respect deserves the attention of all students of the Old Testament. His theological views are those of the Rationalistic school.

The work on Luis de Leon, by Dr. Wilkens, (Fray Luis de Leon, Halle, 1866,) is a very interesting Protestant biography of a Roman Catholic saint of the sixteenth century.

A large amount of valuable information on the educational system and the educational institutions of England and Scotland may be found in a work on that subject by Dr. J. A. Voigte. (*Mittheilungen über das Unterrichtswerer Englands und Scotlands.* Halle.)

Among the theologians of the liberal (Rationalistic) school of German theologians, Dr. Schenkel, Professor of Heidelberg, is one of the most prominent and most prolific. His work on the life of Jesus (*Characterbild Jesu*, Wiesbaden) has already been published in a third edition, and has also been translated into French. (*Jesus Portrait Historique.* Wiesbaden, 1865.) Its standpoint corresponds, on the whole, with that of the American Unitarians, and in point of ability is probably not excelled by any other publication of the same school. The most recent publication of Schenkel is a work on the present condition of the Protestant Church in Prussia and Germany. (*Die gegenwärtige Lage der protestantischen Kirche.* Wiesbaden, 1867.)

Among other publications of the same theological school is a German translation of Pecaut's work on the religion of the future. (*Die reine Gottesidee.* Wiesbaden, 1866.) The author goes further in his opposition to evangelical Protestantism than Schenkel, and has theological views similar to those of Theodore Parker. The fervor of his style has found many admirers.

Among the modern systems of philosophy which earnestly aim at a reconciliation between Christian doctrines and philosophical speculation, belongs that of Franz Baader, who counts among his followers many of the ablest philo-

sophical writers of Germany. Some of his ideas on state, society, and Church have been collected into a volume by Professor Hoffmann. (*Grundzüge der Societäts-Philosophie.* Wurzburg.)

Among the manuals of Hebrew archæology that by Prof. De Wette still occupies a very prominent place for the completeness and accuracy of its information, and for the lucidity of its arrangement. (*Lehrbuch der hebr.-jüd. Archæologie.* Leipzig.) The fourth and latest edition has been thoroughly revised and published by Dr. Ruebiger, Professor at the University of Breslau.

Professor Bisping, of Munster, (Rom. Cath.) has completed his "*Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels and Acts,*" (*Evangelisches Handbuch zu den Evangelien,* Munster, 1866, 4 vols.,) by the commentary to the Acts. The same author has previously published a commentary on all the Pauline Epistles. He is regarded as one of the most prominent exegetical writers of the Roman Catholic Church. Another Roman Catholic work on the Acts, by P. Hake, (*Darlegung der Apostel geschichte,* Paderborn, 1866,) is intended to be an apologetic history of the Apostolic Church from the Roman Catholic point of view. A Roman Catholic commentary by Dr. Bucher, (*Die Apostelgeschichte,* Schaffhausen, 1866,) is more popular than scientific, and forms the fourth volume of a popular commentary to the New Testament. (*Die heil. Schriften des N. T.*)

Art. XI.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly, April, 1867. (Philadelphia.)—1. Rebaptism. 2. Meaning of the Word κτίσις in Romans viii, 19–23. 3. The Apostle Paul. 4. The Scriptural Anthropology. 5. The Fundamental Law of Christian Worship. 6. Open Communion.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, July, 1867. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Hebrew Word Yashabh. 2. The Aim of Christianity, for those who Accept It. 3. Schaff's History of the Christian Church. 4. A Philosophical Confession of Faith. 5. The General Assembly.

Congregational Review, July, 1867. (Boston.)—1. Justification and Sanctification. 2. The Pietists of Germany. 3. Theories of the Will. 4. Preaching from within. 5. The English Congregational Colleges. 6. Benjamin F. Hosford. 7. Modern Pagan Writers. 8. Short Sermons.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, July, 1867. (Dover, N. H.)—1. Religious Sensationalism. 2. Speculative and Practical Men. 3. Demoniacal Possessions. 4. Perseverance of the Saints. 5. The Holy Spirit. 6. Divine Attributes. 7. Christ's Presence with his Embassadors.

Mercersburg Review, July, 1867. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Apostolic Commission. 2. The Humanity of Christ. 3. The Word and Sacraments. 4. The Essence and the Form of Christianity. 5. The Authority of the Church in the Interpretation of Scripture. 6. The Satanic Back-Ground in Redemption. 7. Arianism. 8. Athanasius. 9. Cornelius's Memorial. 8. The Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

North American Review, July, 1867. (Boston.)—1. The Origin of the Italian Language. 2. Serfdom and the Emancipation Laws in Russia. 3. Swedenborg's Ontology. 4. Longfellow's Translation of the Divine

Comedy. 5. The Judiciary of New York City. 6. The Labor Crisis. 7. On the Testimony of Language respecting the Unity of the Human Race. 8. Rousseau and the Sentimentalists.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, July, 1867. (Boston.)—1. Religious Skepticism in America. 2. Cobb's Commentary on the New Testament. 3. Whittier. 4. John Murray. 5. The Humanitary Aspect of Christianity. 6. The Country—Its Condition.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1867. (Boston.)—1. The Moral Faculty as distinguished from Conscience. 2. The Relations of Geology to Theology. 3. Free Communion. 4. Theological Education in England.

We give the just and liberal notice of M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopædia:

We have examined this volume with some care and much pleasure. There are critics who affirm that it contains errors. They might have made this affirmation without opening the volume. It is impossible to prepare any work of this kind without an intermixture of error. All our encyclopædias and dictionaries are unavoidably disfigured with mistakes. But the present volume, when compared with the majority of our books of reference, may be highly commended for its accuracy. It evinces learning and faithfulness. It is of course more favorable to the Arminian school than if it had been prepared by Calvinists. It is more copious and complete in those articles which will more particularly interest the Methodists than in those which will more particularly interest other denominations. When we consider the design of the work we cannot pronounce this a fault. We regard the work as one of great value to all denominations of Christians. We trust that it will have, as it deserves, an extensive circulation, not only in the large and important sect for whose use it was primarily intended, but also in the other sects, to which it affords much information otherwise inaccessible.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1867. (London.)—1. The Swedish Reformation. 2. Ritualism and the new Tractarian School. 3. Ecce Deus. 4. Erasmus. 5. Inspiration. 6. A Mohammedan Commentary on the Bible. 7. Milman's Historical Works. 8. Whose are the Fathers? 9. "Among the Masses." 10. "Table" or "Altar?"

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1867. (London.)—1. The Roman Question. 2. The Imagination—Its Functions and its Culture. 3. The Book of Job. 4. Herbert and Keble. 5. Rogers on Agriculture and Prices. 6. Dr. Abraham Simpson. 7. Reform and the State of Parties.

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, July, 1867. (London.)—1. The Cistercians in England. 2. Folk Lore and Old Stories. 3. Joannes Scotus and the Eucharistic Controversy. 4. The Fathers of Greek Philosophy. 5. The Reign of Law. 6. England and Christendom. 7. History of France under the Bourbons.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Early Administration of George III. 2. Agriculture and Prices in England 1259–1400. 3. Professor Ferrier's Philosophical Remains. 4. The Council of Constantinople. 5. Indian Costumes and Textile Fabrics. 6. Life and Speeches of Lord Plunket. 7. Wine and the Wine Trade. 8. Josiah Wedgwood. 9. Burton's History of Scotland. 10. The Military Institutions of France.

JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE, July, 1867. (London.)—1. The French Oratorians—II. Nicholas Malebranche. 2. Eternal Punishment. 3. The Universities. 4. The Expulsion from the Garden. 5. Job. 6. The Site and Rivers of Eden. 7. The Quotations of Scripture. 8. A Sermon on Canticles i, 3. By Richard of Hampole. 9. The Book of Job.—A Revised Translation. 10. Schenkel on Christianity and the Church. 11. Thoughts on the Book of Jonah. 12. White's Life and Writings of Swedenborg.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Mimicry, and other Protective Resemblances among Animals. 2. Lucius Annæus Seneca. 3. The Last Great Monopoly. 4. Lyric Feuds. 5. The Future of Reform. 6. Jamaica. 7. The Religious Side of the Italian Question.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Christianity and its Conflicts, Ancient and Modern. By E. E. MARCY, A.M. 12mo., pp. 480. D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

There seems little hope that the present century will witness in this country a conciliatory discussion between Romanism and Protestantism worthy of the religion which both profess, utterly dismissing all unfairness of representation, each side assuming the other's honesty and possible rightness, and with union on the basis of truth for its object. Ever since the dark hour when Charles V. drew the sword, in compliance with the behest of his spiritual superior, to drown the Lutheran movement in slaughter, the discussion has been involved with secular politics, and tinged with the hues of blood. In our own country the Romish element has belonged mainly to a particular race; that race badly represented by its least civilized portion, tracing its incivilization but too truly to ages of Protestant oppression. It has, as yet, insisted, in our land, on preserving a compact political unity under the control of its spiritual guides. The question of religious truth between the two sects has therefore been embittered by historical and political hate. Publications on both sides have been partisan and unfair, calculated to render their own side intensely partisan, and the other side intensely angry. To the catalogue, unnecessarily long, of this sort of publication, Mr. Marcy has here made an unnecessary addition. He has given us a book calculated to offend Protestants, and render Romanists still more fanatical.

More than two hundred pages are expended by Mr. Marcy, with varied success, in clearing the dogmas of Romanism from

misstatement and misconception, and (with far less success) in demonstrating the claims of papal supremacy and infallibility. More than one hundred more draw a picture of the effects of Protestantism in Europe, on the principle of saying all the bad and as little good as he can of Protestantism, and as much good and as little bad as he can on the other side. About one hundred more give us a frightful picture of Puritanism, very much in the tune of the political speeches of "Sunset Cox" during our civil war, delivered to copperhead audiences in New York in behalf of "leaving Puritan New England out in the cold;" that is, of uniting with the slaveholders, and so dividing the nation as to cut off the eastern states. That popery and slavery should hate New England is not wonderful. It is the old feud of despotism and ignorance against freedom and enlightenment. It is the great law case of *the slave-auction versus the free school.* New England is generally hated only by those whose hatred is a compliment. Finally, Mr. Marcy's closing chapter is a very crude attempt at making us believe that Romanism is rapidly gaining upon Protestantism. We do not suppose that Mr. Marcy is a bad man; but whether Romanism is good or bad, or (what is the real truth,) a very large mixture of both, we think Mr. Marcy's book is not a good book. It is a condemnable advocacy, even if it be of a good cause.

Mr. Marcy is often quite successful in clearing the theoretical dogmas and the theory of some of the Romish practices of misconception, and even setting some of the great merits of Romanism in a clear light. It was a sublime part the Church played when the barbarians of the North overswept the Roman empire, embracing the entire enlightened area of the globe. The Church, then, basing herself upon the remnant of ancient pagan civilization, took the great truths of religion and conquered spiritually her barbarian conquerors. She breathed into the wild hordes the breath of a Christian life. Even the denial of the right of private judgment wrought a mighty good, for Rome could think a thousand times more wisely for the rude barbarian than the rude barbarian could think for himself. Her very despotism was a blessing, for it brought the incongruous tribes toward unity, and laid the basis of the modern European system. The monasteries were the retreats of learning and thought. The great theologians of the middle ages dealt profoundly with the deepest questions, and we now turn over with reverence the pages of Aquinas and Anselm. We strike a blow at Christianity itself when we refuse to attribute the darkness of those ages to

the original barbarism of Europe, and persistently forget how much of theological truth and genuine piety animated the great ecclesiastical body to which Bernard, Columba, Kempis, Pascal, and Fénélon belonged. But when the ages rolled and the era came when Luther's clarion voice announced to Rome that young Christendom had become old enough to think for herself, then did spiritual despotism reveal her intrinsic badness, entitling her to be symbolized by the great apocalyptic beast. History furnishes no instance of any power so gigantic, so omnipresent, so relentless in cruelty. There can be no honest denial that, as a persecuting power, her equal is not in human annals. Nor is it a commensurate, though an amply true reply, that Protestantism has abundantly persecuted too. The great question is the right of private judgment, of which the Protestant side is self-evidently the side of freedom and tolerance, and that of Rome as clearly the side of despotism and persecution. Rome met young Protestantism with the bloody assertion of her claim, and whenever and wherever she has had the power the despotic claim has been bloodily repeated. Rome initiated the bloody work on the most stupendous scale upon self-defensive Protestantism, and, in spite of many Protestant retaliations which in the nature of things could not but be, hers has been the aggressive position and the crushing purpose. We could, however, forgive Romanism her entire persecuting past if she were anything but persecuting where she has the power at the present day. Nor has it been our fortune to meet the first Catholic writer or speaker who does not defend the intolerance of Romanism in Spain and South America with logic which would sustain the same intolerance in the United States had Rome here the same power. Strange as it may seem, a hundred Italian gentlemen, with a gentleman whose cognomen is Pius, at their head, could at any time send forth a decree which would soon terminate religious intolerance in Christendom; but they are just as little likely to do it in the nineteenth century as in the sixteenth. Nothing will accomplish that result but compulsion; and the force that deprives them of the power to persecute, they will *denounce as Protestant persecution.*

It is pleasant to repeat that in Mr. Marcy's pages many of the theoretical objectional points in Romanism are well explained, or greatly relieved. He denies all priestly power to forgive sins, making the priest's pardon simply declaratory, and valid only when the repentance is sincere. He denies all *worship*, in the ordinary sense, of the virgin or the saints, of images or of pictures. He

affirms very justly the great merit of Rome in sternly maintaining the laws of marriage and of chastity. But he is fatally feeble in sustaining the Roman episcopate of Peter, or the rightful supremacy of the Roman See. He draws up, with an apparent pleasure, quite commendable, a programme of the points on which all Christians agree. Full agreement in all, the world is little likely soon to see; but tolerance in all, if long postponed, will be pre-eminently the crime of Rome.

It is curious to note how the accusers of the "Puritan preachers," meaning thereby the evangelical ministry generally, contradict each other. Mr. Marcy holds the evangelical Church as responsible for anti-slaveryism, the war, and the abolition of slavery. So do the Democratic party generally. On the floor of Congress they denounced the war as a "ministers' war," and declared that as ministers had caused the war, ministers should stand the draft like laymen. On the other hand William Lloyd Garrison, Theodore Parker, and the New York Tribune, with their whole set, have loudly denounced the evangelic Church and ministry as pro-slavery. Rationalists and infidels have proclaimed the triumph of irreligion, grounded on the failure of the Church to sustain the cause of truth and righteousness. Which is the *diabolos*, the falsifier? Either, or both? One thing is certain: The pro-slavery democracy are conscious of no cause of gratitude to the northern Christian ministry in the great thirty years' contest.

The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament: Considered in Eight Lectures, delivered before the University of Oxford, in the Bampton Foundation. By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M. A., of Exeter College, and Rector of Walcot. From the second London Edition, with Improvements. 24mo., pp. 258. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: G. S. Blanchard & Co. 1867.

It is the spontaneous and superficial impression of the popular mind that the Bible is one book. The analysis of the scholar readily recognizes that it is rather a library, small in size, but great in import, compressed between covers. A still deeper analysis, followed by a profound synthesis, finally returns to the momentous conclusion that the *books* are *one book*. Amid variety of mind and style there is a oneness of object and a consistency of sequence, evincing one great higher superintending and guiding authorship.

The work of Mr. Bernard is the latest and one of the clearest demonstrations of this oneness and progress, especially as apparent

in the New Testament. That the Old Testament is a progressive ONE, and that both testaments constitute a unit, he preparatorily recognizes; but his main object is to show how the successive books, and sections of books, namely, the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, present, not only in each book in itself an advancing development, but in each group of books an advancing stage to a consummation.

From Matthew to John, Christ unfolds himself by successive revelations to our view, in word, deed, and character. Read first the Sermon on the Mount, with its entire initiatory and opening announcements, and then the closing discourse in John, and mark what an advance you have made! And yet that closing discourse in John is, from beginning to end, an avowed prelude to a further opening future. It finishes by declaring that the matter is unfinished. And if, with a minuteness we cannot here detail, you compare each book, you will equally find that each rises, terrace-like, above the other, evincing both that the successive books are placed in the right order, and that in the right order they march with steady advance.

Now as the four first books are the Gospel of Jesus in his earthly work initiating his Church, so the Acts of the Apostles is the Gospel of the ascended Jesus, from his throne of exaltation guiding and confirming his Church in organism and doctrine. This fresh view of the Acts, first developed with the startling effect of a modern discovery by Baumgarten, becomes clearer upon every repeated reading of that book. The book opens with the ascension, enthronement, promise, and waiting of the Apostles, until in due time the ascended Head sends down his Pentecostal Spirit to anoint his Church and quicken it with power for action. Then it will surprise most readers to note how often the guiding Head, at each moment of exigency, discloses his person: to Stephen, to Saul, and then by person or spirit controlling every important movement of Paul. The Apostle of the Gentiles, not without purpose, becomes the *main figure*, the condensation of the Church into a single personality. The history of the Church is sketched, and its doctrine rudely outlined preparatorily—*for the Epistles!* The Acts is the key-stone of the arch, of which the Gospels and Epistles are the side curves.

The Apostle of the Gentiles has been wonderfully prepared in Acts to become the leader of the advance. The Christianity historically traced in Acts, must be doctrinally unfolded in the succeeding books. The dogmas, briefly outlined, must be spread out in their final fullness; and by whom? How strangely do the apostles of

the Gospels, the primal twelve, either sink to a subordinate position, or utterly disappear from the scene; while the culminating apostle of the Acts reigns predominantly in the Epistles, the very apostles that transiently appear in the former being allowed to appear subordinately in the latter. And he whose actions were so controlled by Jesus from on high is furnished with a Gospel "by revelation," not from man, but by Jesus Christ. By his hand, mainly, the Christianity appearing in objective outline in the historic book is rolled out from an inspired mind in these doctrinal books. And so the Christian facts and the Christian doctrine are completed.

Of this history and doctrine the full consummation appears in the final stage, the Apocalypse. Mr. Bernard's brief survey of this book is invaluable. The Bible is incomplete without this mysterious book. With all its mysteries there are a few bold points, appearing like headlands in the future, so conspicuous and clear that the Church has never mistaken them. Herein the Apocalypse is the plainest of books. First, the book abundantly assumes the Pauline sacrificial theology of salvation through the blood of the Lamb. The doctrines of the Epistles are both realized and transcendentalized. The atonement is clothed in words of intensest emotional power. And the future consummation of this great sacrificial work is outlined in a series of symbols, connecting the earthly progress with the heavenly machineries, showing that all the advances are God's unfoldings of the great work. Herein we have pictorially outrolled to us, 1. The *Cause* of the consummation, the once slain yet now glorified Lamb. 2. The *History* of the consummation, in a series of symbolic images. 3. A terminal *Coming* of the Lord, the key-note of the whole book. 4. A *Victory*, the result of the struggle. 5. A *Judgment*, the settlement awarded to the probationary combatants in the great world-battle. 6. A *Restoration* of redeemed humanity to a glorified social state, under the image of a heavenly city. Hence the Apocalypse, however obscure the details of its symbols, is, in its great points, transparently the book of the future, the book of hope, victory, and glory.

Our rude outline will show our readers that this is quite a big little book. It is pregnant with swarming suggestions. Professor Hovey, the American introducer, enthusiastically pronounces it "as nearly perfect, both in substance and form, as any human production can well be made." Its style is never florid, but remarkable for its pure transparency of conception and the exquisite mold of its sentences. It leads to many high promontories of thought, whence grand and distant prospects can be grasped by the mind's eye.

Liber Librorum: Its Structure, Limitation, and Purpose. A Friendly Communication to a Reluctant Skeptic. 16mo., pp. 232. New York: Scribner & Co. 1867.

"The Bible is the word of God;" or, "The Bible contains the word of God." Which of these two propositions is true? If the former, then the Bible is our master; if the latter, then we are master of the Bible. If the former, then the evangelical theology stands, the vehicle and the regulator of Christian feeling; if the latter, Rationalism gains the ascendant; and after, for a while, in deference to evangelicism, displaying a fine glow of devout feeling, will soon dissipate its vague emotionalism and relapse into cold, hard Sadduceeism, that is sure of nothing, and ready to admit itself to be little better than Atheism.

The author of Liber Librorum is yet in this first stage of devout rationalistic evangelicism. He may personally remain there. But for those who adopt his views his abolishment of the ties that bind to evangelicism opens the sure downward path. Theodore Parker, with his rare talent, could use his intuitional rationalism as an instrument to stir the emotions; but when he departed no successor could wield his wand, and his flock has vanished to the winds. Wesley took the evangelical-biblical theology; he roused the hearts therewith of his age, and his instrumentalities in the hands of his successors have formed a flock upon whose fold the sun never sets.

The present little volume is written to raise the candid skeptic a step or two higher, by showing him that a qualified acceptance of the Bible is possible. The author examines the book's own professed claim to inspiration, and finds that it embraces not the entire Bible. For those who complain that we have no criterion to distinguish the authoritative from the unauthoritative, he asserts that the true heart does possess a "verifying faculty." That verifying faculty is "reason enlightened by the Holy Spirit." This, he holds, is *safe*: for it puts the testing power into the hands of the regenerate; and only of the regenerate who are conscious of being "enlightened by the Holy Spirit." And undoubtedly where this "faculty" does pronounce a passage uninspired, the inspiration may fairly and safely be surrendered. But how shall the test be tested? Admit once that authority deserts some parts, and who will feel himself bound to wait for the decision of this author's test? Our author next asserts the Bible to be a symmetrical whole, and gives a fine chapter or two, showing this wholeness and unity. He then examines the classified "difficulties" of the Bible, and shows, with alternate suc-

cess and failure, how admirable an organ his theory is for their solution. He exhibits for our examination some contradictions, which, it is worth while to note, are mostly in biblical *numerals*, where mere errors of text are most likely to happen. Then, in a chapter entitled "The modern Pharisee," he administers caustic castigation to those who hold a more peremptory theory of interpretation. No severity of our author, however, at all equals the bitterness of the "Preface to the American edition," the writer of which (at the numerals 1, 2, 3, page 9) literally stuffs his stuff with words of opprobrium.

To our own view it is the *authority* of the Bible over our faith which is, even before the matter of inspiration, the *first* and most important question. The *authority* of the Old Testament we hold to be mainly founded upon the New Testament. Christ did quote the Old Testament as a final authority both for himself and his hearers. All the New Testament writers occupy the same position. That a statement is in the Old Testament, in *whatever part*, does, with Christ and his apostles, render it a decisive *authority*. No one ever imagines, when Jesus quotes, that he is liable to the reply; That is in an unauthoritative part. No doubt all sides held that authority to belong only to the original true text, as it came from the hand of the primitive writer. The real Old Testament is assumed as authoritative in the New. And the same Lord Jesus Christ is the voucher for the authority of both Testaments. The contemporary Church of Christ, to whom the apostles spoke and wrote, endowed by him with the gift of the discerning of spirits, really did by spontaneous concurrence accept the New Testament canon as a perfectly true, complete, and unquestionable expression of its religion. Hereby having the *authority* of both Testaments sanctioned and settled, its *inspiration* is a secondary question; important and profoundly interesting, indeed; but incapable of disturbing the firmness of our reliance upon every part and particle of the true text in matters of faith and doctrine.

For the absoluteness of the authority of every genuine part and particle of the Bible over our faith, it is unnecessary to affirm the same mode, or the same degree, of inspiration for every portion. The Jewish Church held to four great methods. The celebrated "John Smith, of Cambridge," wrote an essay expounding and maintaining these four methods; and it is noteworthy that Mr. Wesley inserted Smith's essay in his "Christian Library." We can easily conceive, indeed, a high state of spiritual inspiration, circumscribed within religious limits, highly and perhaps perfectly

authoritative within its sphere, yet perfectly consistent with mistake regarding a secular or historical fact. Stephen's mind was doubtless filled with the Holy Spirit. It was exalted to a high state of purity and spiritual power. He doubtless at the moment possessed higher, truer views of Christianity than any living man. Well would it have been if all had for the moment been wise enough to accept his authority within this sphere. Yet we see no possibility of clearing some parts of his final speech from historical mistake. When an unquestionable instance can be adduced of one of the inspired canonical *writers* having made a statement irreconcilable with truth, undoubtedly we must in that instance admit the limitation to his inspiration. But we wait for that instance to be adduced. The *authority* of the true text still stands over our religious faith. The Bible, the whole Bible, is the standard of ultimate appeal.

A Critical Review of Wesleyan Perfection. In Twenty-four Consecutive Arguments, in which the Doctrine of Sin in Believers is discussed, and the Proof-texts of Scripture advocating Entire Sanctification as a Second and Distinct Blessing in the Soul after Regeneration fairly debated. By Rev. S. Franklin, A.M., of the Illinois Conference. 12mo., pp. 614. Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, for the author. 1866.

Works coming from the hands of our Methodist ministry before our official periodicals are ever amenable to two questions: Are they in accordance with our established doctrine? and, Are they accordant with reason and Scripture? To the first of these two questions the author of the present work would, we suppose, himself return a prompt negative. He professes to institute a re-examination of the doctrine of Christian Sanctification, and to invalidate fundamentally the views heretofore considered as settled, and he desires the issue to be upon the second question.

His positions are two. First, What is usually called *entire sanctification* is truly nothing more than regeneration, and takes place in its fullness at justification; in such fullness, indeed, that the regenerate soul is always "sinless." Second, Nevertheless, *sanctification*, *holiness*, and *perfection* in man are terms never subjective but always objective in their application; that is, they always apply to the outer and not to the inner man. Regeneration is the interior work; sanctification is its exterior effect. So that there is no such thing as holiness of heart!

We do not consider the argument in favor of the latter of these two positions to be maintained with sufficient plausibility to require any extended refutation. Taking the key text, *Be ye holy for I am holy*, will any mortal man deny that God is subjectively

holy? And does not the reason assigned for their being *holy* require a like holiness? If they must be holy because God is holy, must they not be subjectively holy because God is subjectively *holy?* Is not the Holy Spirit subjectively holy? And does he not produce an interior holiness in the heart within which he dwells, making it like unto himself?

The identity in time of entire sanctification with justification, and its identity in nature and degree with regeneration, is a doctrine held by a few Methodists at the present day. We think it not in accordance with our standards. It is an error against which Mr. Wesley directly and conclusively wrote. The attempt of our present author to show that Mr. Watson's description of regeneration and entire sanctification coincide so as to leave no difference between them, is a total failure. We do not, however, purpose to occupy our present pages with the discussion. We are writing a notice, not a review.

Finally, in the kindest spirit toward our young author, who is a graduate of the Ohio Wesleyan University, and who in the general manifests an excellent and loyal spirit and good ability as a writer, we must say that he was not born for the work, and exhibits no qualification for mending our theology. We regret that so bootless a book was ever written, or that its even unofficial printing at an official press should aid its Methodist circulation. We trust that no Methodist pulpit will be appropriated to promulgate its doctrines to the perplexity and confusion of our people.

A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. By J. P. Lange, D.D. Translated by Philip Schaff, D.D., in connection with American Divines of various Denominations. Vol. IX. of the New Testament contains the Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude. 8vo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

The biblical student will find this a very rich volume. The entire translation is done by Dr. Mombert. Upon James the Introduction and critical notes are by Lange, and the doctrinal and homiletical are by Van Osterzee. Upon Peter's Epistles the entire commentary is furnished by Fronmüller. John is treated by Dr. Karl Braune, and Jude by Fronmüller. We are gratified to find that the patronage of this great work sustains the editor and publishers in pushing it with characteristic energy.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Physiology and Pathology of Mind. By HENRY MAUDSLEY, M. D., London, Physician to the West London Hospital, Honorary Member, etc., etc. 8vo., pp. 442. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867.

DR. MAUDSLEY'S work comes to us as an accredited standard in the deeply interesting and important subject it treats. The author claims to embody the latest results of German research, and to possess a perfect familiarity "with the writings of such men as Professor Bain, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Dr. Lacock, and Dr. Carpenter," leading representatives of a peculiar section of English philosophic thought. His favorite authorities in metaphysics are Locke, Hobbes, and Spinoza. His mastery of the physiological part of his subject is very complete. His style is vigorous and trenchant, cumulative, and tending to the involved, yet generally clear and elastic. He displays an admirable amount of self-confidence, and is brilliantly belligerent; being often quite as positive upon points he little understands, as upon points he has completely mastered. We are confident that a mathematician *may be* a good poet; we believe that a physiologist may be a good mental philosopher; but Dr. Maudsley's case would be a powerful negative instance against the latter belief. About two hundred pages of the book are devoted to the physiology of the mind; about two hundred and forty to its pathology. In the former section the author gives his views of the nature of *mind*, as suggested and sustained by the anatomy of nerves and brain. He is cruelly destructive upon the psychology of the schools, and the popular view of mind or soul, which he pronounces to be "an abstraction made into a metaphysical entity." Mind is a composite result, made up of the constituents furnished by the various parts of the nervous system. Will is not an individual faculty, but is often identical with intelligence; and the doctrine of the *freedom of the will*, so called, is an illusion. Yet we are frank to say that we see nothing in his physiological facts to necessitate his anti-psychological and unmetaphysical doctrines. All his physical science, all his empirical items, and, we may add, all his anti-metaphysical logic, we can read without the slightest disturbance to our established views of the legitimacy of our present mental science, whether relating to the reality of a distinct spiritual self-hood, a moral nature, or a freedom of the will.

Dr. Maudsley vigorously charges that consciousness is unreliable and inadequate to a science of mind. We reply that consciousness is as reliable as perception; and that physiology is inadequate to as many things as psychology. His onslaught is very

jauntily unguarded against a whole series of possible retorts. How slow, blundering, and inadequate has physiology been and still is! Psychology has never accepted her help, simply because she has had so little help to offer. It would certainly be more modest in that prattling infant science to be less quarrelsome, in its babyhood, with its older sisters. Its first utterances should partake a great deal less of self-sufficient snap and snarl. It is very doubtful to our own mind, from our examination of Dr. Maudsley's book, whether physiology is able either to invalidate, add to, or in any way modify, the science of pure psychology, any more than it can the science of pure logic or mathematics. Psychology is simply a *systematized analysis of the operations of thought as found in or by consciousness.* Whether consciousness is reliable or not, whether adequate or not, to a complete science of mind, does not touch the question of its legitimacy as a science. And though physiology may add a great many adjacent facts surrounding the circumference of the science, it is doubtful how far the facts she offers have any right to come within it. No doubt, in preparing a work on mind for our college classes, it may, as has heretofore been done, be practically important to draw large illustrations from the facts of physiology. We may even infer many things as to the nature of consciousness from those facts. But physiologists like Dr. Maudsley are grandly mistaken as to the overruling power of physiology in the domain of psychology.

When the psychologist pronounces the simple word *sensation*, or *sensibility*, he names a thing which physiology, with all her knives and lenses, could never discover should she search until doomsday. The searcher must come into the world of consciousness and identify the *feeling* answering to the term. For the moment we utter that word with understanding of its import, we have entered the threshold of a new existence. We are in the inner world of mind. However near in space, the two, the inner and the outside worlds, are in nature infinitely wider apart than Herschel and the Sun. Without that *consciousness*, so much berated, the physiologist could never enter that wondrous interior world. And so superior is that interior world to the cold, dead, outside world, that immensity might just as well be an infinite blank, except just so far as that outside world of matter contributes to the happy existence of that inside world of mind. But this *sensation* or *sensibility*, above named, is but the first step into that world; the most infinitesimal cross of the dividing line drawn between the insensate and the conscious existence. When mind passes forth from the state of *sensa-*

tion into the act of perception, and first ascertains an *outwardness* or *exteriority*, and identifies external *objects*, then for the first time the insensate outside world has a chance to rise above the valueless nothingness of blank space, and become good for something. It then first attains, virtually, if not actually, a real existence. We believe we can indeed conceive of a world of insensate matter as existing apart from and in the absolute non-existence of intelligence in the universe. But we repeat that but for the existence of that intelligence, and the capacity of that insensate to contribute to the well-being of that intelligence, matter and space are equally worthless. Pure sensation, the bottom and the base of thought, could never know that exterior world, but might be made happy by it. It is when the mighty change comes in which mind rises from *state* into *act*, that she first *notices* the world and concedes its value. If it be replied that whatever be the value that mind concedes to matter, it may nevertheless possess a value of its own, our answer is, that nothing exists in the universe competent to contradict the pronunciamento of mind upon matter; for the insensate cannot know itself, and cannot defend itself, and universal judgment must go against it by default. Mind, however, does not stop at the direct act of knowing the external and the object; she revolves back and directs her glance upon herself, and realizes her own existence and her own operations; finally, in her highest effort, falling back upon herself and uttering the self-conscious *ego*, which nothing lower than humanity can utter. Of all this physiology can know nothing. What right has she to talk, as Dr. Maudsley makes her, of volitions, emotions, sensations, and perceptions? Physiology must borrow or steal them all from consciousness.

And now we say it was unquestionably a most legitimate and important work, within this wonderful kingdom of mind, to analyze and classify the modes and natures of thoughts, and to ascertain what can be consciously ascertained of their operations and laws. The work lies simply within the circle of consciousness. And whatever is found to be the validity of consciousness, or its adequacy to a full revelation of human nature, the work was a great and legitimate work. If Linnæus could wisely analyze and classify the plants of the vegetable kingdom, and so construct a science of botany, so, far more wisely, could Locke and Hamilton classify thoughts, and so construct a science of psychology. Should vegetable physiology assail botany as inadequate and worthless because a large amount of additional knowledge could be furnished from her discoveries about plants, it would be a very

unscientific assault both in spirit and in principle; almost as unscientific as it is for Dr. Maudsley to assail psychology because his researches can add something to our knowledge of mind unknown to mental science. For any real addition all true psychologists will thank his colaborers and himself. Whether or not the addition come properly within the bounds of strict psychology, no liberal thinker will fail to rejoice over any gains to our stock of anthropology.

It is not clear to us, however materialistic many of his phrases and expressions appear, that Dr. Maudsley is what is usually or rightly termed a *materialist.* In accordance with the new philosophy, which finds that the entire variety of things in nature is but the varying forms of FORCE, he seems to hold that mind in man is *the highest form of force.* Hence, though matter and mind are but different forms of the same primitive force, you may still consider matter as material, and mind spiritual; or you may hold both to be spiritual, or both material. In other words, the terms material and spiritual lose much of their distinctive meaning. Without kindling up a quarrel with him on this point, we should prefer to consider nature as *force*, and intelligence as something absolutely higher, namely, as *power.* Force is blind; but power in the form of intelligence controls it. All force, in all its forms throughout nature, is obedient either to blind necessity or to *intelligential power.* Hence, again, mind is superior, prior, controlling, and originating. God, the supreme mental *power*, is the controller, being the generator of all force; for force is physical, and power intelligential. A true psychology has, we believe, nothing to fear from a true physiology, nor a true theology from the new philosophy of FORCE.

As sensation is in the world of mind, we may as well admit that in the lowest order of being the dawn of *sensation* is the *dawn* of a soul. From that feeble dawn, closely dependent upon matter, soul is found gradationally rising in strength and self-sustaining independence, through perception and consciousness, into the grasp of infinite and universal truth. The soul, whether of man, brute, or insect, is immortal, not by intrinsic physical immortality, (which belongs to God alone,) but by being placed and retained in *the conditions by which it is held undying.* An insect on earth might be maintained immortal by being placed in such vitalizing conditions as secured perpetual life. Man's soul, unlike brute soul, endowed with independent energy, may survive the wreck of the body; may as *power* invest itself with subtle *force* or essence, forming for itself an ethereal organism, and may live in

a vitalizing atmosphere provided for its disembodied state, until the resurrection restore it to an organism worthy to stand by the side of the glorified second Adam.

The Culture Demanded by Modern Life: A Series of Addresses and Arguments on the Claims of Scientific Education. By Professors TYNDALL, HENFREY, HUXLEY, PAGET, WHEWELL, FARADAY, LIEBIG, DRAPER, DE MORGAN; Drs. BARNARD, HODGSON, CARPENTER, HOOKER, ACLAND, FORBES; HERBERT SPENCER, Sir JOHN HERSCHEL, Sir CHARLES LYELL, Dr. SEGUIN, Mr. MILL, etc. With an Introduction on Mental Discipline in Education, by E. L. YOUMANS. 12mo., pp. 473. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

THE object of this work, as expounded by its American editor, Professor Youmans, is to advocate the exclusion of Greek and Latin from the complete educational course, and the occupancy of the blank space with science. He does, indeed, incidentally admit that in the case of "professional scholars," like John Stuart Mill, the classics possess the value Mr. Mill assigns to them. But the complete "culture" of the educated American gentleman should substitute additional science in the place of the ancient languages. We look upon such a doctrine as false and pernicious. Mr. Youmans had better have titled his book "A Plea for the Formation of One-Sided Character."

We suppose there is no leading college in our country which has not had before its authorities the question, What is the culture demanded of our colleges by "modern life?" It has been repeatedly and fundamentally discussed, by men duly feeling their responsibilities, quite as well aware of the conditions of "modern life" as their most advanced contemporaries, and fully intelligent of the precise nature of the existing curriculum. The object of the college scheme of study is, not to train men for one particular profession, trade, or art, but to lay a well-rounded common basis upon which any special profession may be built. It purposes to embrace those fundamental acquirements of which the pursuer of any elevated calling is likely to feel the deficiency if wholly omitted. The uniform result has been, that while parallel courses, optional with the student, have been established, and partial courses have been allowed, and scientific schools have been added, the outlines of the old scheme have been retained as the programme of a well-balanced fundamental training. We have not the slightest doubt that these were wise decisions.

The man trained on Mr. Youmans's plan, with a strict eye to the business he is to follow, will be a narrow pattern of a man. The large and liberal man is possessed of a round of acquirements

which he may never be obliged to use in his profession. In a fragment in the appendix of this volume, quoted from Dr. Draper, headed (with characteristic self-sufficiency) "Deficiencies of Clerical Education," a large acquirement of science is recommended, in patronizing style, to the American ministry. This advice is in a measure right; not because the American ministry have largely to do with science in their profession, but because it enlarges, liberalizes, and gives weight to the character, to possess a well-rounded amount of knowledge beyond the limits of your own profession. Perhaps, however, the mere facts of natural science, however well classified in the mind, are of all knowledges the least elevating. Literature, mental philosophy, esthetics, have for this liberalizing object a preference over physiology, botany, or mechanics. Unless the individual mind has the capacity for generalizing and tracing these latter sciences into higher analogies and relations, they load the mind, and render the character heavy, sordid, and technical. Such is the natural tendency of Mr. Youmans's theory of unbalancing the general educated mind of our country with a disproportionate amount of dead science. No increasing amount of existing science ought ever to induce us to sacrifice the symmetry of our collegiate curriculum. To Mr. Youmans's teachings on this point, excellent antidotes may be found in Professor Comfort's article in our present number, and in Dr. Olin's lectures noticed below.

Of the series of lectures in this volume the three best are those by Professor Tyndall, Dr. Paget, and Professor Liebig. The performance of Professor Tyndall is redolent of the rare genius of the man; that of Dr. Paget strikingly illustrates the doctrine of purpose as exhibited in physiology; that of Liebig is a very compact history of science, traced by the hand of a master. With all its drawbacks this volume is well worthy republication and perusal.

The closing lecture is by Professor Youmans, and, if we understand his language, inculcates the most trenchant materialism; maintaining that thought is but the action of the *brain*, and that the dividing man's nature into two parts, body and soul, is the source of great errors and injuries in the world. A reverent acknowledgment of the overruling mind of God, however, frequently occurs in this and others of his writings, indicating that he does not accept the unintelligent "Unknown Absolute" of Herbert Spencer as the substitute for a living God. But we understand not how the Supreme Mind, in his view, can be any more independent of matter than the finite mind. Is the material world the brain of God, and its motion his infinite mind?

History, Biography, and Topography.

History of the American Civil War. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. In three volumes. Vol. I, containing the Causes of the War, and the Events preparatory to it up to the close of President Buchanan's Administration. 8vo., pp. 567. New York: Harper aud Brothers. 1867.

Draper, Youmans, & Co. are an American firm, with extensive connections in England, acting as large dealers in physiology. They furnish us metaphysics according to physiology, theology according to physiology, education according to physiology, and, as in the present volume, history according to physiology. Whoso boards with these gentlemen must expect to eat, drink, sleep, and dream physiology. "And that," Mr. Lincoln used to say, "reminds me of a story." The story goes that in certain districts of Wales the goodness of the cow is estimated by the quantity of hairs in the butter. A traveler, probably a Yankee, in that section, once found that at supper the cow was quite too good; at least the butter was quite too capillary. "Prithee, ma'am," says he to his hostess, "put your hairs in one plate and your butter in another, and let me mix for myself." We pray you, Dr. Draper, put your physiology in one book and your history in another, and let us mix for ourselves.

Nevertheless, though the dose of scientific dissertation is large and formal, it is not only not irrelevant to the great subject he treats, but the example of Dr. Draper may induce future historians to bring such views more fully into their works. The shape of a country's territories, its climate, its variations of surface, in various ways modify the train of its events. Dr. Draper's ultraism on this point, like most ultraisms, will press the due measure of truth upon the public mind. His book will be not so much *the* history as *a* peculiar and impressive history, under a certain aspect, of the great event it describes. He carries his views, without knowing how to guard them, to an unequivocally fatalistic extent. The sapient critic of the book in the Round Table undertakes to justify him on the ground—doubtless true—that he is no more fatalistic than John Calvin or Jonathan Edwards. Dr. Draper professedly shows that with such a climate, etc., shaping the character of the populations North and South, the great civil war must take place, and the South, must be beaten. Of course a Jefferson Davis, a General Lee, and an Andersonville must be. Dr. Draper seems to think that he solves the difficulty by telling us that now science will teach us how to rise above the necessities

of physiology. It is a vain plea. That very science is itself, first, one of the results of the necessitating antecedents; and, then, it can only take its place as one of the elements that necessitate the future. It is one of the constituents that shape the character of men and so shapes the future event. We are still ground in as fatalistic a mill as ever, all according to physiology.

We are gratified to say that Dr. Draper has not availed himself of the present history to ventilate any anti-biblical or anti-theological notions he may entertain. He has interpolated no dissertations to show that the books of Moses are a late oriental forgery, or that the titular name of Christ is a plagiary. He has adhered to his subject, and given us many strong, fresh, unique pages. Whatever other history of the Great Rebellion you may have read, Dr. Draper's is likely still to be quite worth the reading.

Educational.

The College, the Market, and the Court; or, Women's Relation to Education, Labor, and Law. By CAROLINE H. DALL, Author of "Historical Sketches," "Sunshine," "The Life of Dr. Zarzewska," etc. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1867.

MRS. DALL is a Unitarian lady, of great benevolence of character, deep religious sentiment, and of considerable ability as a writer, who has devoted her talents to humanitarian objects, and especially to the removal of the artificial disqualifications resting under our present social system upon her own sex. She pleads with no little skill and a great array of facts for equal privileges of collegiate education, equal rights of property, and equal rights of suffrage in the selection of representatives by whom her destinies are to be governmentally controlled. "Woman's Rights" she merges in and identifies with "Human Rights." That woman *can be*, nay, *is now*, not only in Asia and monarchical Europe, but in republican America, though with diminishing rigor, the subject of a most oppressive legislation, terribly demonstrating that she had no hand in making the laws, is an overwhelming historical truth. Those soft phrases of a factitious "gallantry" about the "gentle controlling influence of woman," her being "represented by her husband," etc., etc., make a ridiculous figure under the strong light of universal and innumerable facts. The "slave code" of the past is not blacker than the "woman code" of the past. No negro slavery was ever worse than the woman slavery, existing in its full force at the present hour in less civilized

regions, existing in most unjust force until late reforms in our own country, existing in remnants of singular atrocity in civilized Christian Europe, and especially in Protestant England. The traces of that slavery are now the plague-spots upon our present social system. The awful pages of Mrs. Dall's book, headed "Death or Dishonor?" are an appalling demonstration of this truth. Under woman's present exclusion from avenues of livelihood, and the low remuneration of female industry, the alternative presses perpetually upon an annual army of females, *starvation or prostitution.* Politics, and press, and pulpit are silent over the greatest wrong of the age; and why? Give woman her share in the government of our country and see how long it would last.

We thank the noble heart and head of Mrs. Dall for her book. We ask of the Christian ministry and Church, we ask of the Methodist ministry and Church, to procure and read it. It seems to us that none but a mind encased in prejudice can rise from its perusal without feeling that emancipated woman would be the purifier of our social system.

Four years ago, in an article on Lay Representation in our own Church, we furnished a paragraph, written with all the solemnity, earnestness, and energy of language our nature afforded, avowing that no exclusion of female suffrage from such a representation would ever meet our individual sanction. A brother editor, of whose warm fraternal feeling toward us personally we have had most ample testimony, severely took us to task for this paragraph, as if it were a mere partisan quirk of ours to throw obstacles in the way of lay representation. Our excellent brother did not see, what we both saw and felt, that he cast upon us a charge of deeper dishonesty than we ever had suffered in our life. If we could pen so solemn a paragraph as a mere dodge, of what hypocrisy could we not be guilty? Those intimately acquainted with our individual sentiments very well know that the rightfulness and expediency of female suffrage has for thirty years formed a part of our creed. The only reason why a due share of the Quarterly has not been devoted to the advocacy of that reform is, that the Quarterly was not our personal property, or the allowable organ of all our individualisms. A belief in the right of every competent human individual to have a due share in controlling the social system controlling that individual's destinies, lies at the bottom of our advocacy of negro emancipation, of lay representation, and of female suffrage in State and Church. What our sentiments were many years ago will appear from

the following paragraph in our Φ. B. K. oration, entitled "The Man-Republic," delivered at the Wesleyan Univerity in the year 1850:

> I would even presume to suggest, not the opinion, but the query, that as society is composed of the blended traits of both sexes, in which the stern energies of the one are softened and saved from barbarism by the softer virtues of the other, so might not our government be refined and civilized from much of its present ferocity, if the gentler half of the world possessed their share of right, to select their public as well as domestic lords? Our governmental spirit is too masculine; the representative too nearly of what society would be without the softening spirit of womanhood. And I venture to hint the query, whether the certainty of woman's presence would not soon transform the rabble-disorder of our political election rooms to the chaste propriety of a lyceum or a Church. I question, whether the mobocracy would rule in its present unwashed supremacy; whether the whisky cellars would vomit up their florid-faced demonocracy to come, vote, and conquer; and whether those great cruel abominations which rear their fierce faces, in opposition to all the impulses of humanity, would long stand with *her* permission, the sympathies of whose heart are so often, and especially upon such subjects, far wiser than the hardened calculations of man's head. At any rate, I trust I may have awakened in your minds the most serious question, whether it is not the worse part of our nature which is best represented in our government; and whether in our national *man* the *will* does not really misperform the intentions of the entire soul.

College Life: Its Theory and Practice. By Rev. Stephen Olin, D. D., LL.D., late President of the Wesleyan University. 12mo., pp. 239. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

"The Baccalaureate Discourses in this volume," says a well-written preface, "were addressed by Dr. Olin to the young men under his charge during the last years, the lectures during the last months. The writing of the lectures was his closing literary labor, their delivery his final public utterance. A precious legacy to his students, in whose welfare he was most deeply interested, their earnest words have in many instances given permanent impressions to character, decided direction to conduct." It is refreshing to compare the solemn, elevated, purifying spirit of these pages, reining up the souls of the young hearers to a sense of their high eternal responsibilities, with the low and sordid tone of narrow, earthly expediency maintained by the materialistic inculcators of modern "culture." The former appeals to its auditor as a high immortal man, with a character to form, and a *soul;* the latter rather addresses him as the chiefest of animals, with a self-interest to serve, and a *brain.* We do not conceal our belief that the triumph of the latter would be the curse of our age and the degradation of our race. The mighty spirit of our Olin was symbolized by his majestic figure and great head. He was a most manly man, and it was his mission to transmit a true manliness to the minds he molded.

Pamphlets.

Lay Delegation in the Methodist Episcopal Church Calmly Considered. Its Injustice and Impracticability. By JAMES PORTER, D.D. New York: N. Tibbals. 1867.

DR. PORTER'S pamphlet is not (and does not claim to be) an equal-sided, judicial review of the subject of lay delegation, but a one-sided plea against it. As such it is able, bold, frank, manly, and exhaustive. It takes up point by point until it ranges the whole ground, shrinking from no responsibility, and evading no pressure. It states the opposite argument with intentional explicitness, makes its quotations from the public and uncontradicted declarations of representative men, as published usually in official reports, and while we by no means indorse the soundness of his logic or the full justice of his conclusions, we fully accord both his sincerity in their avowal and the general excellence of his temper in making it. His spirit stands, indeed, in fair comparison with the responses he has received in both the official and unofficial periodicals. And we cannot but suggest to the friends of lay representation that they are not in a position to deal safely in irritating utterances. If they will but allow the Church to move on in its own spontaneous course of thought, lay representation will silently and quietly come into existence by a final unanimous concurrence. But if an angry antagonism be awakened, or a partisan or proscriptive course be pursued, or an organized machinery is disclosed as at work, it requires but a small, firm, embittered minority in our annual conferences finally to check-mate the movement for several quadrenniums. And some of Dr. Porter's utterances indicate that in the final passage through the annual conferences a persistently opposing "forlorn hope" would not be without a fearless and skillful leader.

The sincerity and honesty of Dr. Porter's views, justifying his claim to be courteously and fairly met as a frank, honorable, and open-handed opponent, are evinced by the historic fact that he is but defending life-long opinions. More than twenty years ago he defended the existing institutions of the Church against the abolitionists of New England, as he now does against a similar movement originating from precisely the opposite quarter. When this latter movement pressed upon the General Conference, however, he made the most just and honorable proposition to leave the question to the vote of the Church itself. The obloquy with which he has been assailed for this proposition is most unreasonable. What more equitable proposal could a minister make to a body of laymen than this: "I firmly believe that lay delegation

is undesirable; but I will leave it to the Church's own decision, and will forego my own views if she decide against me." But he "meant to kill it!" No otherwise to "kill it" than by allowing the Church to refuse a change to which she is truly opposed. We think the putting the question to a Church vote was a noble move. And that the Church may have the advantage of a "sober second thought," we would gladly put it to a second vote; fully believing that the result would, divested of untoward circumstances, be proudly affirmative.

We shall give no analysis of the pamphlet. But we will simply say that from the assumption that seems to us to underlie the whole argument, namely, that the laity cannot safely be trusted with the proposed power, that is, that the Church cannot be trusted with itself, we wholly dissent. If our ministry of a hundred years has but scraped together a mass of people that cannot be trusted to take care of itself, its work has been poorly done. We do not think the ministry as a whole will be losers from a true system of lay representation, either in power or prosperity. We believe that thereby the Church would possess a far greater self-consciousness. Our laity, as a whole, would feel a deeper interest in the Church as a whole. A more loyal and firmer denominational feeling, an intenser and more solid Methodism, would come into existence. Our General Conference would become a weightier body; and its enactments, received by the laity as its own, would acquire a new force and energizing power through the Church. This is, indeed, a matter of conjecture. But if it has ever proved a wisdom to "trust the people," pre-eminently is it a wisdom when that people is a great, intelligent, living Church.

Observe, it is not lay delegation we approve, but, what may be a very different thing—lay representation. Lay delegates elected by the ministry would be lay delegation; but laymen elected by the laity are required to form lay representation. Reluctantly, and probably not at all, can we vote for a second-hand officiary representation. We trust the people. And we solemnly re-affirm, what we affirmed years ago, (as we have noted in our book-notice of Mrs. Dall, on another page) that not with our consent shall woman be disfranchised in the Church of God. We do not say that we will accept no plan which contains that disfranchisement. We may finally accept the best plan we can get. But from that disfranchisement in the plan we withhold our consent and here re-record our protest against it.

Miscellaneous.

Harper's Hand-Book for Travelers in Europe and the East. Being a Guide through Great Britain and Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy, Sicily, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, Greece, Switzerland, Tyrol, Spain, Russia, Denmark, and Sweden. By W. PEMBROKE FETTRIDGE. With a Railroad Map corrected up to 1867, and a Map embracing colored Routes of Travel in the above Countries. Sixth year. One volume, 12mo., pp. 662. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Isthmus of Panama. History of the Panama Railroad, and of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. Together with a Traveler's Guide and Business Man's Hand-Book for the Panama Railroad, and the lines of Steamships connecting it with Europe, the United States, the North and South Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, China, Australia, and Japan. By F. N. OTIS, M. D. With illustrations by the author. 12mo., pp. 317. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

The Last Chronicle of Barset. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE, author of "The Claverings," "Can You Forgive Her," "The Small House at Allington," "Doctor Thorne," "Orley Farm," etc., etc. With Illustrations by George H. Thomas. 8vo., pp. 362. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Bench and Bar. A Complete Digest of the Wit, Humor, Asperities, and Amenities of the Law. By L. J. BIGELOW, Counsellor at Law. With Portraits and Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 364. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Natural History; or, Second Division of The English Cyclopedia. Conducted by CHARLES KNIGHT. Vol. 3. 8vo., pp. 1083. London: Bradbury, Evans, & Co. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Co. Green and gilt, with copious illustrations.

The Land of Thor. By J. Ross BROWNE, Author of "Yusef," "Crusoe's Island," "An American Family in Germany," etc. Illustrated by the Author. 12mo., pp. 542. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Thackeray's Lectures. The English Humorists. The Four Georges. Complete in one volume. 12mo., pp. 449. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

Louisa of Prussia and her Times. An Historical Novel. By L. MUHLBACH, Author of "Joseph II. and his Court," "Frederick the Great and his Family," "Berlin and Sans-Souci," "Henry the Eighth and his Court," etc., etc. Translated from the German by F. JORDAN. With Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 277. D. Appleton & Co.

Bible Pictures, or Life-Sketches of Life-Truths. By GEORGE B. IDE, D.D., Author of "Battle Echoes," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 437. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1867.

Conversations on Ritualism. 12mo., pp. 77. Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

SEMI-CENTENNIAL!—The present number closes the forty-ninth volume of our periodical. The next year is its semi-centennial. We trust that, in *spite* of its age, our Methodist Quarterly Review displays the spirit and bloom of youth. And, in *consequence* of its age, we trust that its friends will rally to confer upon it the stature and vigor of manhood. We shall in due time press this point.

INDEX.

Ahlfield: Predigten über die Epistolischen Perikopen ..... Page 467
Aids to Faith 325
Alford: Greek Testament, with notes 325
Almanac, Methodist, for 1867 163
Alzog: Grundriss der Patrologie 292
—— Kirschingeschichte 292
American Presbyterian, The 112, 292, 438
Apostolic Fathers, The Writings of the 312
Askew, Mistress Anne 163
Athenagoras, The Writings of 312
Atlantic Monthly, The 479, 612
Auberleben: Beiträge zur Christlichen Erkenntniss 437

Baltzer: Die Biblische Schöpfungs Geschichte 436
Bancroft: History of the United States. Vol. IX 147
Baptist Quarterly 293, 438, 612
Barrington: Curious Myths of the Middle Ages .....
Bernard: Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament 617
Bernhard: Reden an Geistliche aus der Kirchlichen Gegenwart 464
Bersier: Sermons 111
Biblical Repertory 112, 438, 612
Bibliotheca Sacra 113, 293, 613
Bibliothéque Universelle du Clergé et des Laiques Instruits 415
Bickersteth: Yesterday, To-Day, and Forever 483
Bigelow: Bench and Bar 636
Bisping: Evangelisches Handbuch zu den Evangelien 612
Blind Basket Maker Library 484
Bogatsky's Golden Treasury 483
Bonifas: l'Unité de l'Enseignement Apostolique 111
Book Concern, The Methodist 267
Its Origin 267
Removal to New York 268
Removal to Mulberry-street 270
Destruction by Fire 270
Present Number of Depositories 271
Its Object 274
Its Financial Status 280
Suggestions 283
Its Future 285
Boehmer: Francisca Hernandez and Frai Francesco Ortez 437
Bonar: Hymns of Faith and Hope 478
Botts: The Great Rebellion 149
Brahmo-Samajh, The 400
Ram Mohan Roy, Sketch of 400
—His Teachings 403
Present Condition 404
Extracts from its Literature, etc 407
Its Relation to the Evangelization of India 410
Probable Fate of Mohammedanism 412
Breck: Walking in the Light 824
British and Foreign Evangelical Review 114, 444, 613
British Quarterly Review 114, 294, 444, 613
Browne: An American Family in Germany 155
Brischar: Catholic Pulpit Orators of the last Three Centuries 292
Buchanan: Poems 157
Bucher: Die Apostelgeschichte 612
Burkhardt: Dr. Luther's Briefwechsel 437

Calm Hour, The ..... Page 483
Canada, Methodism in 198
Introduction of Methodism 199
The "American War" 201
Interference of English Missionaries 203
First Canadian Conference 204
Conference Missionary Society 206
Governmental Disabilities 207
Separation from the Church in the United States 209
Union with the English Conference 212
Influence of local Troubles 214
Disruption of the Union 217
Conditions of the Reunion 219
Statistical statements 220
Caspari: Inedited Sources for the History of the Baptismal Symbol and Rule of Faith 437
Centenary Singer, The 483
Charleston Advocate, The 321
Charlesworth: Sequel to Ministering Children 323
Christianity, The Sure Triumph of 532
Its Triumph over Persecution 535
Its Scholastic Trial 535
The Temptation to Intolerance 536
Full Religious Liberty 537
All other Events subservient to Christianity 538
Christian Remembrancer 294, 444, 613
Christie's Faith 483
Chronology of the Old Testament 389
Variations between the Hebrew and the Septuagint 389
The Septuagint favored by Josephus 390
By the Christian Fathers 391
Agrees better with Heathen Chronology. 392
Probable Reasons for the Alteration 394
Evidence in favor of the Hebrew 396
Septuagint contradicts Moses 397
Egyptian Chronology, etc 398
Birth of the Saviour 399
Church Music. (See Music.)
Clark and Mattison on a Future State 236
Man an Embodied Spirit 237
Arguments for Immortality in Nature ... 239
—In the Lives and Experience of Men ... 240
The Resurrection of the Body 242
Knowledge yet unattained 244
Recognition of Friends in Heaven 246
Objections and Incidental Points 247
Clark: Man all Immortal 236
Clarke, Adam, as a Preacher 50
Extemporaneous 51
Expository 53
Plain 55
Instructive 55
Evangelical 56
Experimental 57
Practical 58
Affectionate 59
Powerful 61
Successful 65
Clarke: Orthodoxy, its Truth and Errors ... 180
Congregational Quarterly 293
Congregational Review 293
Cowles: The Minor Prophets 456
Crook: Ireland and the Centenary of American Methodism 152
Culture demanded by Modern Life, The 628

Dale on Baptizo.....Page 484
Dall: College, Court, and Market.....484, 631
Davis, H. W., Speeches in Congress, etc.... 319
De Forest: Miss Ravenal's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty..... 484
De Vere: Studies in English..... 320
De Voe: Market Assistant, The..... 323
Dickens: Nicholas Nickleby..... 484
Donald Fraser..... 484
Dorpater Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche..... 296
Draper: History of the American Civil War..... 630
Draytons and the Davenants, The..... 163
Dupanloup: De l'Education..... 111
—— De la Haute Education Intellectuelle.. 111

Ecce Homo..... 125
Edinburgh Review.....114, 294, 614
Eldridge: Drops of Water from many Fountains..... 163
Ellis: The Brewer's Family..... 163
Emerson: Essays..... 325
Ennis: Origin of the Stars, etc..... 141
Entire Sanctification..... 555
Episcopal Visitation, Plan of..... 164
Essays and Reviews..... 325
Replies to..... 325
Esthetics in College Education..... 572
The Gradation of our Schools..... 573
Fragmentary Universities..... 575
History of Collegiate Studies in America. 577
Plans of Classification..... 580
Objects to be secured by Esthetic Culture..... 581
Its Value..... 584
The Means by which it may be obtained..... 586
Plan of Instruction..... 587
Necessity of Museums..... 589
Evangelical Quarterly Review.....112, 438

Fairbairn on Prophecy..... 182
Scope of the treatise..... 183
Views of Liberalists..... 184
The Scripture view..... 186
Meaning of Prophet, Seer, etc..... 187
Mode of Prophetic Influence..... 188
Double Sense of Prophecy..... 190, 195
Types..... 193
Apologetic value of Prophecy..... 197
Father Clement..... 434
Fisher: Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity..... 119
Fitch: The Art of securing Attention in a Sunday-school Class..... 324
Foreign Literary Intelligence, 110, 292, 434, 611
France..... 110, 434
Germany..... 110, 292, 434, 611
Russia..... 111
Foreign Religious Intelligence, 105, 287, 431, 607
Brazil..... 108
China..... 434
Eastern Churches..... 289
Evangelical Alliance..... 107
France..... 107
Germany..... 608
Great Britain.....105, 287, 431, 607
Greek Church, The..... 110
High Church Tendencies..... 105
Italy.....109, 609
Protestantism.....109, 607
Roman Catholicism.....109, 289, 609
Franklin: Critical Review of Wesleyan Perfection..... 622
Freeman: Use of Illustration in Sunday-school Teaching..... 484
Freewill-Baptist Quarterly.....298, 438, 612
Fuller: The Brownings..... 163
Fullom: The Mystery of the Soul..... 143

George: The Satisfactory Portion.....Page 324
Gödel: Sclaverie und Emancipation..... 292
Goss: Statistical History of American Methodism..... 137
—— The Centenary Group..... 482
Goulburn: Acts of the Deacons..... 135
Greek Church, The, in its Relation to the Protestant..... 369
Doctrine of the Origin of the Soul..... 369
Natural Moral Condition..... 370
Present Condition of the Human Will... 373
Regeneration..... 375
Article of Faith concerning the Church.. 381
Divisions of the Greek Church..... 384
Infallibility..... 385
Regulations of the Clergy..... 386
Transubstantiation..... 387
Union not desirable..... 389
Greeley: The Great American Conflict.... 153
Guizot: Meditations on Christianity..... 310
Grace Greenwood: Records of Five Years.. 324
Groser: What is a Child?..... 324
Grundemann: Algemeiner Missions Atlas.. 437
Guthrie: Our Father's Business..... 484
—— Out of Harness..... 463

Hackett: Smith's Dictionary of the Bible .. 462
Hake: Darlegung der Apostel Geschicte .. 612
Halm: Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum..... 292
Hardwick: Christ and Other Masters..... 128
Harkness: A Latin Reader..... 158
—— An Introductory Latin Book..... 158
Harper's Handbook for Travelers in Europe and in the East..... 636
Hase: Kirchengeschichte..... 437
Hayes: The Open Polar Sea..... 317
Haven: The Good Report..... 324
Hefele: History of Councils..... 438
Heidenheim: Vierteljahrschrift für Deutsche und Englische Forschung..... 437
Helena's Household..... 459
Hitzig: Die Psalmen..... 611
Hoffmann: Baader's Grundjüge der Societäls Philosophie..... 611
—— Fortschritt u. Rückschritt..... 110
Howell: Venetian Life..... 324
Hurst's History of Rationalism..... 5
Definition of..... 7
Origin of..... 10
Semler..... 12
Lessing..... 14
Kant..... 15
Fichte and Schleiermacher..... 18
Neander..... 21
Rationalism in Holland..... 22
— in England..... 23
Concluding Thoughts..... 26

Ide: Bible Pictures..... 636
India..... 165
Its Geography..... 165
Its People..... 167
Its Mythology..... 169
Its Institutions..... 171
Buddhism..... 174
Mohammedanism..... 175
Westward March of the Gospel..... 176
Effects of British Power in India..... 178
Italian Reformer, An, Jerome Savonarola.. 540
Early Life..... 541
The Medici Family..... 542
Lectures at San Marco..... 543
Is at the death-bed of L. de Medici..... 544
His Eloquence..... 545
Chosen Lawgiver of Florence..... 546
Persecuted by the Pope..... 548
Deserted by the People..... 550
Consents to a strange Ordeal..... 551
Imprisonment and Execution..... 553

Jacobus: Notes on Genesis.....Page 306
Jahrbuch des Gustav Adolph-Vereins..... 436
James: The Bankrupt Law of the United States..... 484
Jobson: Serious Truths for Consideration.. 483
—— The Way of Salvation plainly Set Forth 483
Johnson: Living in Earnest..... 136
Journal of Sacred Literature.. 117, 294, 444, 614

Kirke: The Life of Jesus..... 308
Kneeland: Annual of Scientific Discovery. 472
Knight: Natural History 636
König: Was ist die Wahrheit von Jesu?... 471
Kritzler: Humanität und Christenthum.... 436

Lackland: Homespun..... 483
Lange's Commentary.....484, 623
Lea: Superstition and Force..... 157
Lechler: Acts of the Apostles..... 137
Lectures, Six, delivered in Exeter Hall.... 484
Lee: The Inspiration of the Holy Scripture. 325
Levington: Scripture Baptism Defended... 324
Liber Librorum..... 484, 620
Linton: Sowing the Wind..... 483
London Quarterly Review.... 114, 294, 444, 447
Longfellow: Poetical Works..... 479

M'Clintock and Strong: Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature.....460, 613
Mac Donald: Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood..... 324
Macmillan: Bible Teaching in Nature..... 483
Maudsley: Physiology and Pathology of Mind..... 624
Marcy: Christianity and its Conflicts..... 614
Martin: Decline of the French Monarchy.. 151
Martyr, Justin, The Writings of..... 312
Masson: Recent British Philosophy..... 138
Mead: Grape-Culture and Wine-Making... 483
Mercersburg Review..... 612
Merivale: Conversion of the Northern Nations..... 154
Methodism, The United States and..... 29
Migne's Roman Catholic Publishing House. 415
Abbé Migne..... 415
His latest catalogue..... 416
Summary of his publications..... 418
Means of his success..... 426
Milman: History of Christianity..... 127
Minutes, General, of the M. E. Church..... 132
Ministry, Educational Qualifications for the. 221
Spirit and aim of the early Church..... 222
Natural tendency of culture..... 224
Source of the power of the early Methodist preachers..... 225
Double mission of Methodism..... 227
The Church losing ground..... 229
The philosophy of losses..... 230
Remedy for the evil..... 231
Enlargement of the powers of the itinerancy..... 235
Ministry, Our..... 590
Apostolical succession..... 590
A renewed heart..... 592
A well-furnished mind.....592
Sermonizing..... 593
Naturalness..... 595
Variety..... 596
Clearness..... 598
Plainness..... 599
Reading and reciting..... 601
Originality..... 603
Earnestness..... 605
Morse: authorship of "Rock me to Sleep, Mother"..... 432
Muenscher: The Book of Proverbs..... 313
Muhlbach: Frederick the Great and his Court..... 324
—— Louisa of Prussia..... 636
Muloch: The Two Marriages..... 824

Music, Church.....Page 513
First instrumental music..... 515
Hebrew sacred music..... 516
Early Christian music..... 518
Italy and Germany lead in music..... 520
Scripture authority for the use of music.. 521
Man's natural adaptation for music.. 514, 522
Singing with the understanding..... 524
Singing with the spirit..... 526
Defective Church regulations..... 527
Influences..... 530
My Son, Give me thy Heart..... 483

Nast: Commentary on Matthew and Mark. 325
New Englander..... 112, 293, 433
Newton: The Great Pilot and his Lessons.. 324
Nichols: The Sanctuary, a story of the Civil War..... 168
Nippold: Handbuch der neuston Kirchengeschichte..... 437
North American Review..... 439, 613
North British Review..... 444
Noyes: Job, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, a new translation..... 461
—— Psalms and Proverbs..... 461
—— Theological Essays from various authors 325

Oarnandet: Acta Sanctorum..... 438
Ohly: Mancherlei Gaben, etc..... 437
Olin: College Life, its theory and practice. 633
Original Penalty of the Law..... 249
The condition of Adam's immortality..... 250
Falsity of Pelagian views..... 251
The views of science..... 252
The true doctrine..... 253
The original penalty not fulfilled..... 256
Its nature..... 258
Phraseology of the primal sentence..... 260
Temporal evil not the penalty of sin..... 261
No imputation of sin..... 263
Otis: Panama Railroad..... 484
—— Isthmus of Panama..... 636

Parton: How New York City is Governed.. 155
Pastoral Office: The New Testament Idea of..... 81
The work of the pastor..... 82
Preaching or teaching, its nature..... 83
To communicate the revealed will..... 84
Imparting instruction..... 87
Exhortation..... 88
To oversee the flock..... 89
Serving in temporal matters..... 91
Pecaut: Die reine Gottesidee..... 611
Pelarin: Philosophie Positive..... 111
Perreyre: Entretiens sur l'Eglise Catholique..... 111
Phelps: The New Birth..... 137
Philarete: Sermons..... 112
Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel..... 436
Playter: History of Methodism in Canada. 198
Polenz: George Muller..... 611
Porter: Lay Delegation in the Methodist Church Calmly Considered..... 624
Preaching, Practical Observations on..... 485
Danger of imitation..... 486
Utility of advice..... 490
Defects of homiletical instruction..... 495
Parliamentary, forensic, and academical eloquence compared with that of the pulpit..... 497
Predestination, Judaic, Paul's argument against..... 499
The prophets against it..... 500
Paul in the Epistle to the Romans..... 503
The Jews incensed at this doctrine..... 506
The calling of the reprobate Gentiles..... 508
The Gentiles warned..... 510
Paul to the Ephesians..... 510
Pressensé: Jesus Christ sa vie, etc..... 111, 122

Quarry: Genesis and its Authorship...Page 297
Quarterly Book-Table..... 119, 297, 452, 514

Radical, the..... 325
Raess: Die Convertirten..... 437
Recorder, the Christian..... 160
Reprobation..... 69
Definition..... 69
Proof that God has formed such a decree. 69
Why God has reprobated the reprobate.. 70
What reprobation includes..... 72
Means by which God executes this decree 74
What proportion of the human race were reprobated..... 76
Reprobate infants..... 77
Why God created reprobates..... 78
Why they have the means of grace..... 78
Justice and propriety of unconditional reprobation..... 79
Conclusion..... 80
Reusch: Bibel und Natur..... 469
Revue des Deux Mondes..... 118, 297
Ritualism, Conversations on..... 636
Roberts: Centenary Pictorial Album..... 163
Robinson: Discourses of Redemption..... 181
Rochet: Histoire de Chrisostome..... 111
Round: The Immortality of Character..... 323
Ruebiger: De Wette's Archæologie..... 612
Ryerson: Wesleyan Methodism in Canada. 198

Sabatier: Sources de la vie de Jesus..... 111
Sabbath Chimes..... 483
Sanctification entire..... 555
Wesley's experience..... 556
As taught in the M. E. Church..... 557
Begun in regeneration..... 559
Distinct from it..... 559
A gradual growth toward it..... 561
It may be instantaneous..... 562
What is sin..... 565
The term "Sinless Perfection"..... 566
The witness of the Spirit..... 568
The distinguishing peculiarity of Methodistic theology..... 571
Sanscrit Language, the..... 353
Recent discoveries in India..... 353
Developments of comparative philology. 354
Character of the Sanscrit..... 355
Literature of the Sanscrit, the Veda..... 356
Period of the Sutras..... 360, 362
Buddha, heresy of..... 361
Oral preservation of the Vedas..... 365
Probable contact of the Hindoo and Jewish mind..... 366
Study of the Sanscrit in this country..... 367
Savonarola, Jerome, an Italian Reformer... 540

Schaff: History of the Christian Church.. 319
—— Lange's Commentary..... 623
Schenkel: Characterbild Jesu..... 611
—— Die gegenwärtige Lage der Protestantischen Kirche..... 611
Schmidt: Cyclopedia of Instruction and Education..... 435
Schoolboy, Letters to a..... 324
Scott: The Christ of the Apostles' Creed, etc. 463
Scripture Inspiration..... 325
Considerations *à priori* in favor of inspiration..... 326
The twofold basis of truth..... 326
The Church..... 329
The Bible..... 330
The books of God's enemy..... 333
Nature and design of inspiration..... 336
The inspiration of the Bible not extraordinary..... 337
The Scriptures nothing unless inspired... 341
The theory of supervisional inspiration.. 344
Its opposition to verbal inspiration..... 344
Not opposed by infidels..... 347
Scripture Inspiration: Fatal to sound scholarship.....Page 348
Contrary to the laws of mind..... 349
Its object not attained..... 350
Selous: The Parable of the Prodigal Son.. 315
Sepp: Geschichte der Apostel, etc..... 110
Shanks: Personal Recollections of distinguished Generals..... 154
Shedd: Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.. 452
Simson: History of the Gipsies..... 145
Smith: Dictionary of the Bible..... 462
Smith, Dr. Augustus W..... 93
Southern Review..... 293, 442
Spurgeon: Morning by Morning..... 136
Stars and the Angel, The..... 315
Stevens: History of the M. E. Church..... 476
Studien und Kritiken..... 297, 450
Stowe: Religious Poems..... 324
Taylor: Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry..... 325
Thackeray: Lectures..... 636
—— Pendennis..... 483
—— Miss: The Village on the Cliff..... 324
Thor, The Land of..... 636
Trench: Studies in the Gospels..... 454
Trollope: The Lost Chronicle of Barset..... 636

United States, The, and Methodism..... 29
Co-operation of Church and State..... 29
Elements of American civilization..... 32
The family the social unit of ancient times..... 34
The individual the present unit of society..... 35
Individualized life of Methodism..... 37
The churchly idea..... 38
The sacramental idea..... 39
Divine selection..... 40
True action..... 40
Methodism elevates the people..... 42
The diffusion and the accumulation of knowledge..... 45
Toleration..... 46
Future work of Methodism..... 48
Universalist Quarterly, The...113, 293, 438, 613

Villemain: Tableau de l'Eloquence Chrétienne au IVe siècle..... 110
Vincent: Our Sunday-School Scrap-Book.. 484
—— Two Years with Jesus..... 324
Voigte: Mittheilungen über das Unterrichtswerer Englands und Scotlands..... 611

Wangemann's Travels through Bohemia, etc..... 436
Warner: The Word..... 483
Warren: The Ideas and Feelings necessary to Natural Greatness..... 323
Webster: The Union Considered..... 198
Wells: New Physiognomy..... 144
Wentworth: Philosophy of Methodism..... 323
Wesleyan University—Dr. A. W. Smith... 93
Early Methodist colleges..... 93
Opening of the Wesleyan University..... 97
Sketch of Dr. Smith..... 100
Wesley, C., seen in his finer and less familiar Poems..... 304
Westminster Review..... 116, 205, 447, 614
Whately: The Story of M. Luther..... 324
Whittier: Tent on the Beach, etc..... 324
Wilkins: Fray Luis de Leon..... 611
Winslow: Instant Glory..... 483
Wise: Sunday-School Journal..... 159
Wiskemann: Die Sclaverei..... 292
Wollf: Die Bedeuting der Weltschöpfung nach Natur und Schrift..... 470

Yates: Black Sheep..... 483

Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie..... 296
—— für Wissenschaftliche Theologie..... 450

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA